

APOCALYPSIS ALFORDIANA
FIVE LETTERS
TO THE VERY REV. H. ALFORD D.D.
BY THE
REV. E. B. ELLIOTT M.A.

5/-

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Division.....

Section

Shelf.....

Number.....

1000 1000 1000

2A

1

APOCALYPSIS ALFORDIANA;

OR,

Five Letters to the Very Rev. H. Alford,

DEAN OF CANTERBURY,

IN REFUTATION OF HIS APOCALYPTIC EXPOSITION, AND
VINDICATION FROM HIS CRITICISMS OF THAT
GIVEN IN THE "HORÆ APOCALYPTICÆ."

TOGETHER WITH

A BRIEF CRITICAL INQUIRY INTO THE LITERARY
CHARACTER, AND TRUSTWORTHINESS, OF HIS GENERAL
GREEK NEW TESTAMENT COMMENTARY.

BY THE

REV. E. B. ELLIOTT, M.A.,

INCUMBENT OF ST. MARK'S, KEMPTOWN, AND LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY
COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

SEELEY, JACKSON, AND HALLIDAY, 54, FLEET STREET,
LONDON. MDCCCLXII.

ADVERTISEMENT.

It is not unlikely that to readers hitherto altogether unacquainted with Apocalyptic exposition, the subject, as set forth in the first two Letters of this Pamphlet, may appear intricate and obscure. If so, the fault will soon be seen to lie with the Exposition reviewed, not with the Reviewer. In the case of such persons it will probably very much tend to dissipate the obscurity, and both open before their minds the general subject of the controversy, and enable them to appreciate rightly the argument in those two primary Letters which make up Part I., if they begin by first reading the third and fourth Letters which make up Part II.

The Reader is particularly requested to correct the three following errors of the press, as they materially affect the sense :—

- Page 44, line 10, *read*, . . . Greek, or heathen Roman, . . .
- „ 74, last line, *read*, . . . land (the *cultivated* land, you say,) . .
- „ 91, line 6, *read*, bar me out, *instead of* bear me out.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PART I.

LETTER 1.

	PAGE
On the Substantive Revelations of the Future, and Prophetic Plan of Arrangement, in Dean Alford's Apocalyptic Commentary	1

LETTER 2.

Critical Examination in detail of certain Chief Explanations in Dean Alford's Apocalyptic Commentary	20
--	----

PART II.

LETTER 1.

Dean Alford's Objections against my Exposition of the Seals and Trumpets, given in the <i>Horæ Apocalypticæ</i> , examined and refuted	51
--	----

LETTER 2.

Dean Alford's Objections against my Explanation of the Prophecies concerning the Dragon, the Seven-headed Beast, and the Two Witnesses, examined and refuted	93
--	----

PART III.

Summary of the Apocalyptic Argument; and Critical Inquiry into the Literary Character, and Trustworthiness, of Dean Alford's general Greek New Testament Commentary	141
---	-----

APOCALYPSIS ALFORDIANA.

PART I.

LETTERS I. AND II.

ON DEAN ALFORD'S OWN APOCALYPTIC EXPOSITION.

LETTER I.

ON THE SUBSTANTIVE REVELATIONS, AND PROPHETIC PLAN
OF ARRANGEMENT, IN THE ALFORDIAN APOCALYPSE.

DEAR MR. DEAN,

THE last half volume of your Greek New Testament Commentary, which you were so kind as to send me, duly reached its destination : and I took an early opportunity of glancing at the part devoted to the Apocalypse ; and so acquainting myself both with your own views of the Prophecy, and with the opinions expressed by you respecting mine. On doing this I saw that it would be clearly my duty not to let your Exposition, or critiques, pass without some public notice and examination on my part. This you will probably yourself have anticipated ; and many also of your readers who take an interest in the great subjects of the Apocalypse.

I proceed, now that the necessary leisure is afforded me for it by the completion of my revisal and reprinting of the 5th Edition of the *Horæ Apocalypticæ*, to discharge the

duty which I have thus felt to be incumbent on me. And I propose in the two first Letters that I am now addressing to you to make *your own Apocalyptic Exposition* the subject of my critical examination; in the next two to notice your criticisms (criticisms for the most part of the nature of objections) on *mine*. Gladly would I have been spared the task of entering on the subject of my two first Letters, could it have been omitted with propriety. But you would have had cause to complain were I to pass over your Exposition *sub silentio*. Moreover, it is important to show the defect in respect of strength of evidence and consistency of yours, in order the more effectively by force of contrast to show the strength and consistency of my own; the rather since you have thought well, while condemning them, to pass over in silence almost entirely the strong evidence on which the various interpretations so condemned rest. A concluding Letter will wind up the subject.

Let me just premise that it is a matter of satisfaction to me that we are altogether agreed on three points concerning the Apocalypse:—viz. 1st, that it is a Prophecy dictated by divine supernatural inspiration;¹ 2dly, that it was communicated to St. John towards the close of the reign of Domitian;² 3dly, that the true view of the Apocalyptic Millennium is that of the Pre-Millennial Advent, held by all the earliest Christian Fathers.³ More especially the two first of these points must be remembered, as having an important bearing on the correct interpretation of the general Prophecy.

¹ Prolegom. pp. 242, 243.

² At p. 233 of your Prolegomena, when alluding to my answer to the arguments of Lücke and M. Stuart for the *Neronian* date, you express your opinion that I have there satisfactorily disposed of them all; and thus unhesitatingly (p. 236) speak of the question as settled in favour of the *Domitianic* date.

³ Prolegom. p. 252.

Now, before entering more particularly, and in detail, on the examination and criticism of such parts of your Apocalyptic exposition as may seem most characteristic and important, it will be well, I think, preliminarily (and I therefore purpose making this the subject of my present Letter) to take a *general* survey of its contents *as a whole*: more especially, 1st, in regard of *the revelations of the future*, which it sets forth as here made to St. John; 2dly, of the *order and connexion* of the several parts of the prophecy, in which these revelations were contained. Just such, in fact, was my proceeding when first your Commentary came into my hands. And I must beg you to forgive my saying that this general survey was abundantly sufficient to convince me of the Exposition bearing on its very front its own stamp of self-condemnation; as not only fundamentally erroneous, even *primâ facie*, but absurd.

I. For what, first, is the view presented by it of the *revelations of the future* disclosed in this Book? As near as may be, we shall see, notwithstanding your reprobation of any such idea of the prophecy on the part of others as strange and preposterous,¹ it is really made by your own self to have been almost no revelation at all. An argument this decisive alone, if established, yourself being the judge, against the truth of the Alfordian Exposition: and of which the force will only appear to be yet stronger, and more decisive, from consideration of the circumstances introductory to, and attendant on, its communication.

For consider for a moment, I pray you, the definiteness of the promise made by the revealing Spirit to St. John

¹ So Prolegom. p. 241. "Strange," you say, "that the enquiry should have to be made in this day, Is the book strictly speaking, any revelation at all? Rather, is not its future bounded by the age and circumstances then existing; (*i.e.* at the time of St. John's being in Patmos;) and are not all those mistaken who have attempted to deduce from it indications respecting our own, or any subsequent age of the Church?"

just before the commencement of the symbolizations of the coming future, “Come up, and I will (now) shew thee the things which are to happen hereafter”:—a revelation needed, it is evident, in order to his fulfilment of the third part of the threefold charge previously laid on him by the Lord Jesus; “*Write the things which thou hast seen,—and the things which are,—and the things which are to happen after them*”:¹ and in regard of which, let me observe, the definiteness and particularity of the revelations given him respecting “*the things which were,*” or state of things characteristic at the time then present of the seven Asiatic Churches respectively, as seen by the eye of Omniscience, might well strengthen the Evangelist’s assured expectation of the next coming revelation of *things future* being (in so far at least as the mysteriousness of the future, only to be shadowed forth in symbols, might admit) somewhat similarly distinctive and particular also.—Further consider the august assembly of glorified saints and angels in heaven which gathered round the Divine throne, conjointly with St. John on the occasion; and the intent anxiety of one and all to see and hear the promised revelations: these being revelations, they knew, whether as regarded the future of the Church or of the world, in which not only were the purposes of their God to be

¹ On the verse Apoc. i. 19, “Write the things which thou hast seen, and the things that are, and the things which must happen hereafter,” (*ἀ εἶδες, καὶ ἃ εἰσιν, καὶ ἃ μελλοῦ γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα,*) you vary from the above rendering in our E. V., and explain it thus; “Write the things which thou sawest (just now); *and what things they signify*; and the visions which are to succeed after them.” An explanation this in which I cannot concur. But, as to the fact of the revelations here given being such as concerned the coming future, you fully admit it. So in your Comments both on i. 1, and iv. 1. Also Prolegom. p. 241:—“The Apocalypse, i. 1, declares its own object to be mainly prophetic;—the exhibition to God’s servants of things which must shortly come to pass. To this by far the larger portion of the book is devoted. From chap. iv. 1, to chap. xii. 5 is a series of visions prophetic of things to come.”

unfolded, but his attributes illustrated, and the final triumph of his grace foreshown over all the opposing powers of the world, sin, and Satan. Let this be considered, I say; and surely the result with each candid and sensible inquirer will be a conviction that there was reason given for expecting an intelligible significancy, as well as momentous importance, in the revelations of the future about to be made: so as to intensify the objectionableness of any Exposition which might explain the subsequent Apocalyptic revelations, thereupon to be unfolded, as vague, indistinctive, unimportant; or the mere repetition of revelations of the future already made before.

Such being the case, turn we now to see the substance of the disclosures respecting the future made, *according to your Exposition*, to that august assembly; as the Lamb, who alone was declared worthy of the privilege, opened the successive seals of God's seven-sealed book of fate in which they were written,¹ on its being given into his hands by Him who sat upon the throne. First then, under the symbols of the horses and horsemen of the four primary Seals it was foreshewn, you say, (and you here speak with absolute positiveness as to the obvious truth of this interpretation,) ² that Christ's *gospel-preaching* would ever go forward in successful progress through the world, albeit amidst *wars, famines, and pestilences*; just so as Jesus Christ had previously foretold in his prophecy, Matt. xxiv.,

¹ "The book of Divine Providence, codex fatidicus, seu consiliorum Dei,"—such, after Alcasar, Mede, Vitringa, and others, you explain to be the nature and general contents of the seven-sealed Book. A wider sense this, you add, than that which would make it to be the book of the Apocalypse itself. So Comment. p. 603.

On certain peculiar ideas expressed by you about this book, both as regards the result, or rather non-result, of the opening of its successive seals, and as regards its relationship to the little opened Book of Apoc. x., I shall have to observe at the beginning of my third Letter. See, too, my Note, p. 18 *infra*. They seem to me notions very strange and inconsistent. But with them I am not concerned at present.

² Prolegom. p. 249.

on the Mount of Olives :—further, under the symbols of the 5th Seal, that there was foreshewn, as in Matt. xxiv. 9, the continuous persecution and *martyrdoms of his saints*; the cry of whose blood would call from the earth for vengeance from God against the world's inhabitants, their persecutors: and, under those of the 6th Seal, certain *portents* and *convulsions* indicative, like those in Matt. xxiv. 29, of the imminence of Christ's second coming :—moreover, under the sealing and palm-bearing visions, thereupon next following, the completion of the *gathering of his elect* from the four winds,—another necessary prerequisite to it also noted in Christ's previous prophecy on the Mount of Olives; then, finally, (his coming itself, intermediately, having been most strangely passed over in the Apocalyptic revelations unsymbolized and unnoticed,¹) at the opening of the 7th Seal, under figure of a half-hour's silence in heaven, the “*initium quietis æternæ*,” or beginning of the Saints' everlasting rest.

So under the *Seals*. Besides all which, you say, “there was still much more to be revealed.”² (A naïve remark; at which the admiring reader may surely well think, Had any one single thing previously unrevealed respecting the future been as yet disclosed in this prophecy, according to Dean Alford's explanation of it?³) First, you say, came six of the seven *Trumpet* judgments;—judgments distinctively on the earth and its inhabitants, (not on God's people,) in answer especially to the martyred saints' cries against them

¹ See Note ¹, p. 17.

² Prolegom., p. 255.

³ At page 628 of your Commentary, you thus somewhat curiously state your view of the grand disclosures of the future made, according to your own view of them, under the Seals :—“In the seven Seals we had revealed, as was fitting, the opening of the great Revelation;—the progress and fortunes of God's Church and people in relation to the world, and of the world in relation to the Church.” If you would just write out for yourself, *in detail*, what, and how much, you represent to have been disclosed under the Seals of the fortunes of the one and the other, I think you would be a little surprised at your own haste, or simplicity, in making such a statement.

from under the altar in the 5th Seal.¹ Under the four first of these there were symbolized judgments on earth, sea, rivers, and the lights of heaven; that is, upon the “accessories of life,” perhaps in the sense of “the vitiating and destroying of the ordinary means of subsistence, comfort, and knowledge:”² and then, under the 5th and 6th Trumpets, two “veritable plagues,”—plagues “affecting life itself,”—which were symbolized respectively as irruptions of locusts, and of horses and horsemen from the Euphrates: though what,³ and how to fulfil their destined objects, was a mystery only to be cleared up when the time of fulfilment should arrive, immediately before the Lord’s second advent.⁴ (Certainly but little yet of the promised “much more to be revealed!”)—And so too in regard of the episodic vision in Apoc. x., next following, of the rainbow-vested Angel’s descent, with the little opened book in his hand that he gave to St. John; (a book which you suppose to have been that of a new prophecy, comprehending all that remained of the Apocalypse; ⁵) followed by St. John’s commanded measurement of the temple, or “Church in her innermost hold,” and the Angel’s narrative about Christ’s two sackcloth-robed Witnesses. Which latter figurations, you confess, appear inexplicable to you, save only to

¹ Prolegom., p. 255; also Comment., pp. 618, 629, &c. The supposed connexion of these Trumpet judgments with the martyrs’ cry from under the altar in the 5th Seal, for retributive justice against the earth’s inhabitants, is much dwelt on by you; there being joined with it, you say at p. 631, on Apoc. viii. 3, the prayers of other saints also, offered up by the incense-bearing Angel, introductorily to the Trumpet-soundings. Hence, as will be noted under my 2d head, an important index to your chronology of the Trumpets.

² Comment., p. 633.

³ In your Prolegom., p. 256, you speak of “the strict correspondence” of these two latter plagues “with the foregoing vision of the Seals.” But what you mean by this I am quite at a loss to understand.

⁴ Prolegom., p. 256; Comment., p. 641.

⁵ Comment., p. 651: including, as I shall have to note under my second head in this Letter, the latter half of the 6th Trumpet.

the effect of their being an anticipative compendium, or summary, of the subsequent revelations given in Apoc. xii., xiii., xvii., concerning the Beast from the abyss, the slayer of the Witnesses:¹ though what their use, or why their place here, if such alone their meaning, is a question naturally asked, but to which you give no answer. However, it is to your explanation of *those* subsequent Apocalyptic revelations that we are thus directed to go, (for again you say, “there is more yet to be revealed,”²) in order to our understanding, not of the visions of those three chapters only, but also of what you conceive to have been the purport of the Apocalyptic revelations of the future made in Apoc. xi. to St. John. And so to them we go.

But, having done this as directed by you, it must surely seem strange and disappointing to your expectant readers (if at this point of your exposition any such expectancy remains of real disclosures respecting the then coming future) to find that the whole introductory series of visions in Apoc. xii., with its various symbolizations of the sun-clothed travelling Woman’s persecution by the seven-headed Dragon, at first in the heavenly region, then on the earth, are expounded by you to mean nothing future whatsoever; but only the long-before accomplished historic facts of Jesus Christ’s birth, his persecution through human agencies by Satan, and then, in fine, (the necessarily previous facts of his death and resurrection being here ignored) his ascension to heaven! And this as followed next by a figuring of the same enemy’s persecutions of Christ’s primitive Church in the earlier part of the now closing first century: whether through the Jews in the first instance; or, somewhat later, through the Roman armies that gathered to the siege of Jerusalem, and caused the Church’s flight to Pella,—a flight like that of the symbolic Woman into the wilderness:—all being events, not of the *future*, but of the

¹ Comment., p. 653; Prolegom., p. 256.

² Prolegom., p. 257.

long-before accomplished *past*. It is intimated, indeed, by you that a secondary reference might be intended also in the latter part of the symbolizations of Apoc. xii. to the insulation of the Christian Church through heathen Rome's persecutions, subsequently to the giving of the Apocalypse; or trials through the heresies that somewhat later crept into it from the philosophies of heathenism. This, however, you suggest doubtfully.¹ And, were it even set forth by you distinctly as *the* intended meaning, it would be nothing more than had been told of previously respecting the professing Church by Christ and his Apostle Paul.²—Further, as regards the sequel of “this great prophetic course of visions,” as you call them, just commenced, “respecting the Church,”³ or figuration in Apoc. xiii., next following, of that chiefest of the Church's enemies, the seven-headed ten-horned wild Beast, to which, on its rising from the sea, the Dragon of Apoc. xii. was spoken of as transferring his throne, and power, and great authority,—I say, even as regards it, you explain it as likewise in part a thing of the *past*, and the then *present*, at the time of the delivery of the Apocalyptic prophecy. I do not refer, in thus speaking, to your exposition of this Beast as the representative generally of the world-powers, opposed to Christ and his kingdom, *past* as well as *future*; it being the aggregate, you say, of the heathen persecuting powers of Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Greece, as well as heathen Rome.⁴ In regard of this you may say that the *past* was only *implied* by the Beast's six primary heads apparent in the vision, without any prophetic *notice* about it. But, moreover, you explain the second or two-horned lambskin-covered wild Beast, which was associated inseparably with the seven-headed Beast in this particular vision, as a

¹ Comment., p. 669.

² Matt. xxiv. 5, 10, 11, 12; Acts xx, 30; Col. ii. 8; 2 Thess. ii. 3; &c.

³ Prolegom., p. 257.

⁴ Ibid.; Comment., p. 672.

type of the persecuting Priesthood of *Rome Pagan*, as well as of *Rome Papal*, the latter yet to come; and also the *Beast's image* as distinctively the image of *Pagan* Roman Emperors, such as Domitian, already in St. John's time set up for worship:¹ so necessitating a view of that seven-headed Beast itself as also, in part, the then existing Roman *heathen* power.—No doubt, albeit inconsistently, you speak of the Beast's recovery from a deadly wound inflicted on it, the scar of which appeared on its rising from the sea at the opening of the vision of Apoc. xiii., as realized in the *fall* of *heathen* Rome, two centuries after St. John, and its resuscitation as a power *professedly Christian*;² which explanation implies that both itself, and all afterwards predicated of it, was referable to a time subsequent to that healing of its deadly wound, and its resuscitation in the form of the Roman Popedom.³ Moreover, in expounding the later supplemental figuration of the seven-headed Beast in Apoc. xvii., as in the phase there first depicted, viz., as ridden by the Roman Harlot, (which Beast is wholly identified by you with the seven-headed Beast from the sea of Apoc. xiii.,⁴) it is similarly the Roman *Papal* Empire, in John's time altogether future, that you make to have been there figured. And future too you make what is predicated of the same Beast from the abyss, in its *post-Papal* phase of existence described, you fancy, in the latter part of Apoc. xvii.; as well as what is anticipatively told of it by the rainbow-crowned Angel in Apoc. xi., as the slayer of Christ's two sackcloth-robed Witnesses in "the great city," Rome.⁵ All which, in so

¹ See Proleg., p. 257; Comment., pp. 675, 677.

² *Ib.*, p. 673.

³ At least *mainly* so; the previous rule and era of *Christian Roman Emperors* being also included by you under this phase and 7th headship of the Beast.—Let me here observe that what must needs seem to my general readers strange, and hard to understand, in my present allusions to your peculiar views about the Beast, will be found cleared up in my critical exposure of those views at the close of my second Letter.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 701.

⁵ So in your Comment., p. 658.

far as regards your deduction of it from the prophetic symbols, will be a subject for critical examination in my second Letter. At present what I have to say is that your partial explanation of the Beast from the sea as a thing of the *past* in St. John's time, and explicit reference of its two adjuncts of the lambskin-covered Beast and the Beast's image to the times then *past* and *present*, detract of course so much from the indications of what was *future* in the symbolization of Apoc. xiii.; and indeed eliminate from it almost every particularity of revelation respecting the Roman Beast in its latest form, beyond what had been long previously foreshown in Daniel's vision of the Little Horn of the fourth of the four wild Beasts of Prophecy.

Besides this there was figured in the Apocalypse, you say, but *quite vaguely*, certain preliminary judgments on the Beast's worshippers under its seven Vials; all still, it would seem, as a part of the *εκδικησις*, or avenging justice, called for by the martyrs of Seals from under the altar:¹ and then the destruction by fire and the sword of both the Harlot and the Beast; just accordantly with Daniel's long-previous prophecy of the final destruction of the Beast and its Little Horn by fire:—events these followed in the Apocalyptic visions by Christ's second coming and the Millennium.

Such Mr. Dean is, I believe, a fair abstract of the substance of the revelations made to St. John of the thenceforward coming fortunes of the Church and world, as explained in your Apocalyptic Commentary. And, after deducting what had long before been predicted concerning them either by Daniel, or by Christ himself, or by St. Paul, I pray you to consider, not the vagueness only, but really the nothingness, according to that explanation, of the residuum of Apocalyptic revelations of the future. Consider this in contrast, first, with the direct or implied promise to St. John of new and distinct revelations of the

¹ See Prolegom., pp. 255, 258; and Comment., p. 694.

great coming future; next in contrast with the grand, various, and very extraordinary events and changes in the subsequent history of the Roman World and professing Christian Church, as time has since actually unfolded them: and then say whether I have not had reason for my early assertion in this Letter, that, judged by this one criterion alone, your Apocalyptic Exposition bears on its very forefront its own stamp of self-condemnation, as fundamentally erroneous and absurd. Truly, had such been in real fact the only revelations of the future made on the Lamb's opening of the Book of Divine Providence, St. John might well have wept after them, just as much as before them, from disappointment of the hope held out to him. And well too, in such case, might the modern Infidel smile triumphantly at the confirmation thus furnished of the truth of one of the most cherished of the dogmas of modern Infidelity; viz., that there are no such things as real *bonâ fide* predictions of the future in Scripture prophecy.

II. And now I proceed, as proposed, in what remains of this Letter, to take a general view of *the structure of the Apocalypse, or arrangement order and connexion* of the several parts and prophecies contained in it, as laid down in your Commentary. Very essential one might feel sure, even *à priori*, would be certain retrogressions, recapitulations, and explanatory amplifications, in order to any effective prefiguration of so large and varied a subject as that claimed to itself in the Apocalyptic book; viz. that of the coming destinies, from St. John's time to the consummation, of the Church and of the world: just, indeed, as in the retrospective sketching of the same great and varied subject in a book of history. And, supposing that there are such retrogressions, &c., in it (a fact which every expositor almost admits, yourself included), then must the necessity be equally obvious, with a view to a correct understanding

of the prophecy, of a right arrangement of them; and of the chronological synchronisms, or successional sequences, of its several parts. Not surely without reason has Mede been famed as an Apocalyptic expositor very mainly from the fact of his having been the first carefully to infer such synchronisms from the *internal* evidence of the prophecy itself; prior to, and irrespective of, any particular scheme of *historic* interpretation.—Now, the *internal* data seemingly prominent in the Apocalypse for such a correlative arrangement, whether successional or synchronic, of its various parts, are, 1st, the three septenary Apocalyptic successions of Seals, Trumpets, and, in fine, Vials; 2dly, the twofold or threefold figurations in different parts of the prophecy of the same seven-headed, ten-horned Wild Beast, and the $3\frac{1}{2}$ times, 42 months, or 1260 days (whether literally or mystically to be understood) of his destined continuance in power, and oppression of Christ's faithful saints and witnesses; (for, since Daniel, in his parallel prophecy of the 4th Wild Beast's Little Horn, mentions but one such period of $3\frac{1}{2}$ times = 1260 days, there can be little doubt, I think, as to the identity of the several Apocalyptically-noted periods of that duration; ¹ whether that of the Woman or faithful Church's invisibility in its wilderness exile, that of Christ's witnesses prophesying in sack-cloth, or that of the holy city being trodden under foot of Gentiles,—these being events not only consistent with, but almost implied in, the fact of the Beast's having during that period paramount power and authority); 3dly, that of the notices in various parts of the prophecy of one or another figured event occurring alike under the same Seal, Trumpet, or Vial, or other notable Apocalyptic era; (*e.g.* very specially that of the epoch of Christ's coming, and the consummation;) as well as being all alike (at least if accordant with the revealing Angel's words) subsequent to the date

¹ So you too *incline* to think.

of the giving of the Apocalypse to St. John in Patmos.— Besides which *internal* data for Apocalyptic arrangement, supposing a Commentator to have decided on the fact of any part of the prophecy having had its fulfilment in the *historic past*, there then follows, of course, 4thly, an *historic* datum for the right chronological placing of connected events correspondently therewith, whether as happening before or after it. And since, notwithstanding your various and strong protests against “a continuous historic interpretation,” you yet fully and distinctly assign an historic sense, with a prolonged historic period of the past thereto attaching, to one of the most largely-unfolded, as well as most important, of the Apocalyptic symbolizations, viz., that of the Roman Dragon of Apoc. xii. and Roman seven-headed ten-horned Beast from the sea and the abyss of Apoc. xiii., xvii., xi., you thereby furnish the help of just such an historic datum towards an Apocalyptic chronological arrangement correspondently with your theory; at the same time that it furnishes also a criterion and testing-point of the truth, or untruth, of the general Apocalyptic exposition connected with it.¹

Aware of course of the desirableness in every case of a synoptic view of the Apocalyptic contents, according to the structural arrangement recognized by an Expositor, you present your readers, at p. 259 of your Prolegomena, with your own Tabular Scheme of it: a scheme of arrangement in nine parallel columns, the main principle of which seems to be the common ending (whatever and whenever their beginning) of each and every one of these nine divisions of the prophecy in what (though by the way but once spoken of in the Apocalypse, viz., Apoc. vi. 17) you perpetually

¹ Had the Beast been simply explained by you as a symbol of the *world-power* generally, so as it is by certain German and Anglo-German expositors, and all else of the Apocalyptic prophecy been construed vaguely, so as in your Commentary, the subjecting of the comment to a chronological arrangement, and so a chronological testing, might have been avoided.

refer to as “the great day of the Lord.”¹ Fair, no doubt, *primâ facie* may seem this your schedule of arrangement; with its notice *in red ink* of the introductory vision of the throne set in heaven, and the Lamb’s receiving the seven-sealed book of fate or Providence out of the hand of Him who sat thereon, running all along *above* the nine columns, as their common heading; followed similarly by a parallel notice *in red ink* of the vision of the new Jerusalem, running all along *at the bottom*, as their common ending. But when, after carefully considering this Tabular Scheme, and comparing it with the views expressed on the subject matter of its several columns respectively in your Commentary, an intelligent reader looks to see how it may consist with an arrangement on that principle of *chronological parallelisms* which can alone present to the eye a correct view of the Commentator’s idea of the structure of the prophecy, how does the symmetry of your Tabular Scheme forthwith disappear, a rude dislocation ensue of its before apparently well-united parallel or adjacent parts, and Chaos seem to take seat over against it as the presiding *genius loci*! For, however the bottom of the several columns may, according to your exposition of their contents, alike synchronically terminate in the consummation, the position of that which stands at the top, and immediately between the top and bottom of one and another of those columns, is found to be anything but chronologically parallel with that which stands beside it in the column adjacent: nor indeed in the same column are its successive constituent notices found to be in any order of chronological sequence, such as their placings there might seem to imply; according, as before said, to your own interpretation of the Prophecy.

¹ Proleg., pp. 255, 249, 260; Comm., pp. 616, 620, 621, 692, &c. On the indistinctness of your views about this “day of the Lord,” see my Note, p. 30.

Thus in the 1st column the *first four Seals*, notwithstanding their markedly successive openings in the heavenly vision, are expressly declared by you to be not consecutive in point of time, but only “co-ordinate and correlative;”¹ *i.e.*, I presume, that the gospel-preaching, wars, famines, and pestilences, which you suppose them respectively to symbolize, were prefigured as what would all run on synchronically and intermixed, (with some mutual relationship perhaps, such as of cause and effect,) from St. John’s time to the consummation. And so, too, in a measure, the 5th Seal’s subject of the saints’ martyrdoms from age to age; save only that the *collective* cry of their at length *completed* number from under the altar against earth’s inhabitants, their murderers, is regarded by you as chiefly the subject of the prophetic figuration, when waxing louder toward the time of the end.² But then, as regards the 6th Seal (which surely in all consistency ought to come under the same law of “co-ordinate and correlative” arrangement as the Seals preceding), you assign to the elemental convulsions therein figured, whether to be construed literally or figuratively, a chronological place distinctly and only at “the period of the Lord’s coming:”³ that is, as you elsewhere somewhat inconsistently explain your meaning, “not that of Christ’s coming itself,” but that “of the very eve and threshold of the day of the Lord.”⁴—And such too is chronologically the place, as you explain it, of what was figured in the *sealing vision*,—though not in that of the *palm-bearing*,—which conjointly fill up the 2d column of your ‘Tabular Scheme: the latter, just as the 7th Seal’s symbolic half-hour’s silence in heaven that followed next afterwards, having

¹ Proleg., p. 255. Also Comment., p. 612; “These four seals are strictly correlative, not consecutive on one another.”

² Comment., p. 618. Also Proleg., p. 255. ³ Comment., p. 619.

⁴ Prolegom., p. 255. See again my Note at p. 30, on the doubtfulness and mistiness of your views on this subject of “the day of the Lord.”

its place subsequently to Christ's actual (though unrepresented) coming,¹ at the commencement of the saints' admission to their heavenly and everlasting rest.—Thence, turning to the Trumpets in your 3d column, the judgments figured in them, you tell us, “were in answer to the whole (*sic*) prayers of God's Church;” *i.e.*, to the saints' and martyrs' cry for their avenging, after their number should have been completed. Consequently the chronological place of all the Trumpet-judgments, whether successional, or (like your Seals) “co-ordinate and correlative,” is fixed by you as subsequent not only to the 5th Seal, but to the 6th Seal; in other words, “to the very eve of the great day of Christ's second coming.”²—And this involves the chronology of what the 4th column in your Tabular Scheme presents to us; viz., the episodical figurations of the rainbow-crowned Angel's descent, St. John's measuring of the Apocalyptic temple, and the Angel's narrative of Christ's sackcloth-robed Witnesses' 1260 days of witnessing, their murder in Rome's great city, and subsequent resurrection and ascension. For, instead of this being an episode “*between the 6th and 7th Trumpets*,” as you state at the head of that

¹ “The time for Christ's coming is not yet (*i.e.*, not under the 6th Seal). First his elect must be gathered from the four winds, the complete number sealed [*i.e.*, as in the sealing vision], before the judgments invoked by the martyred souls descend on the earth, the sea, and the trees. First the seer must be vouchsafed a vision of the great multitude whom none can number in everlasting glory. *The day of the Lord's coming is then gone by*; and the vision reaches forward, beyond it, into the blissful eternity.” Proleg. 255.

² So Proleg., p. 255. Also Comment., pp. 618, 629, 631, 635, 661. At p. 249 of the Proleg. indeed you write; “As the seven Seals, so the seven Trumpets and the seven Vials *run on* to the time close upon the end.” From which expression a hasty reader might be led to suppose that the commencing *terminus à quo* of the Trumpets “running on” might, as in the case of the Seals, be from an early date. But the references given above show that such is not your view in regard of the Trumpets; and of course not in regard of the Vials.

4th column,¹ in really flagrant contradiction to the Apocalyptic representation, it is most markedly placed in the Apocalypse itself *under the latter half of the 6th Trumpet*; the judgments of that Trumpet being expressly noted as ending not until after certain notable results and consequences of the Witnesses' ascent to heaven, subsequently to their death and resurrection.² And, since this falls under the 6th Trumpet, if the 1260 days of the two Witnesses' witnessing in sackcloth, and the 42 months of the Gentiles treading the Holy City, told of in Apoc. xi., be identical alike with each other, with the Woman or faithful professing Church's $3\frac{1}{2}$ times' exile in the wilderness, and with the 1260 days of the supremacy of the Beast from the sea, or abyss, the Witnesses' persecutor, (= Daniel's little horn,³) as you seem inclined (not without reason) to suppose them,⁴ then must the chronological place of these last-mentioned events and eras, which constitute the subject-matter of your 5th column, be fixed, like that of the 6th Trumpet, under which they are Apocalyptically placed, to the very "eve and threshold of the day of the Lord's second coming." Yet, with marvellous inconsistency, you refer certain very important parts of these figurations to the times of the primitive Church's persecutions, previous to John's exile in Patmos; and times too when, as in Domitian's reign, the

¹ And so, too, Prolegom., p. 256; "the two episodes *between the 6th and 7th Trumpets*."

² Another strange incongruity in your Apocalyptical arrangement here becomes notable. You make the little book given by the angel of Apoc. x. to St. John to contain in it "the remainder of the Apocalyptic prophecies;" inclusive, it would seem, of the latter half of the 6th Trumpet, and thus bisecting it. So Comment., p. 651. What you would have to be the relation of the seven-sealed book to the septenary of visions revealed on the opening of its seven seals, respectively, is a mystery quite beyond my comprehension. To this point I shall have to advert somewhat fully at the opening of my third Letter.

³ Comm. p. 706. Why I note this will appear hereafter.

⁴ I say *inclined*, not *decided*. See Comment., pp. 655, 656, 670.

Roman Pagan Emperor's images were set up for worship: for here at length, as before said,¹ notwithstanding your protest against all continuous historical systems of interpretation, *historic explanations* of the prophecy, of long range in respect of time, are given by you; and consequently *historic data* furnished such as call for a chronological arrangement consistent therewith. Moreover, you make the Beast's reign, after that his deadly wound was healed, to be either that of *Rome Papal*, the culminating acme of which is absolutely fixed by history to the long-since past era of the middle age; or else that of some supposed *post-Papal empire*, yet future.²

As to the figurations of Apoc. xiv., Apoc. xv. and xvi., Apoc. xvii., xviii., and part of xix., and Apoc. xix. 10—xx., which are the subjects respectively of the four last of the nine columns of your Table, it is evident that the chronological place of one and all is immediately before the consummation: these being figurations severally of Angels declaring the time to have arrived for judgments on the Beast's adherents and on Babylon, followed by the harvest and the vintage, or final ingathering of the saints, (as you explain the harvest-symbol,) and destruction of the wicked: and then by the Vial plagues, which are expressly said to be the last plagues of God's wrath; and, in fine, the actual destruction of Babylon, and the Millennium.

I append a Schedule of your Apocalyptic Scheme of structure, drawn up, in illustration of what has been said, on the principle of *chronological parallelism*; in contrast with the fair-looking, but deceptive, Scheme of parallelism given in your Prolegomena; which seems arranged on no principle that I can discover, save only that of the several

¹ See p. 14, *suprà*.

² All this the reader will find illustrated by my full discussion, and *exposé*, of the Alfordian theory of the Apocalyptic Beast in the latter part of my next Letter.

columns having a common ending in the consummation. And let me ask, if such a synoptic historic view of the fortunes since St. John's time of the Church and of the world, drawn up to the present time retrospectively, would be scouted by you, (as I am sure it would,) alike on account of its own utter inconcinnity and inconsistency, as well as on account of its vast historic omissions, how can you satisfy yourself with supposing it to represent the Apocalyptic scheme of the future, as sketched prospectively by the Omniscient Spirit of God?¹

I am, dear Mr. Dean,

Faithfully yours,

E. B. E.

LETTER II.

ON CERTAIN CHIEF EXPLANATIONS IN DEAN ALFORD'S
APOCALYPTIC COMMENTARY, CONSIDERED CRITICALLY IN
DETAIL.

DEAR MR. DEAN,

I now turn, as the heading of this Letter states, to an examination of certain of your chief Apocalyptic Interpretations *in detail*; and shall with this view select (you will admit my fairness in doing so) those which are not only in themselves most important or characteristic, but on which moreover you declare yourself to rest with the most implicit confidence. Thus there will come up for examination, 1st,

¹ In the Alfordian Scheme appended, what is included in the primary part, marked A, must be understood to have been unwritten, the seven-sealed scroll containing nothing of it; what is included under B to have been written in the little opened Book of Apoc. x.

your explanation of *the four first Seals*, as figuring the continuous course of Christian gospel-preaching, intermixed with wars famines and pestilences, throughout the whole coming future of the world's history : 2dly, that of *the 6th Seal*, as figuring the signs immediately precursive of the day of the Lord, or Christ's second coming ; 3dly, your interpretation of the symbolization of the *Man-child of the sun-clothed travailing Woman* in Apoc. xii., as meant of Jesus Christ's birth and ascension. All which three points you speak of as "landmarks" and "touchstones" of true Apocalyptic interpretation ; and so certainly true as actually to furnish "Canons of interpretation," to depart from which, on the part of an Expositor, is an act of "self-condemnation."¹ 4thly, there must be examined your historic explanation of the seven-headed wild Beast of Apoc. xiii. and xvii. as mainly the Roman Papal Empire ;—a figuration which constitutes, as it were, the nucleus of the latter half of the Apocalyptic prophecy, and with which nearly all else in that division of it is directly or indirectly connected.—Besides which, before ending my criticisms on your details of exposition, certain particular and important oversights and omissions in your view of the prophetic data may perhaps call for a passing notice.

The two first mentioned points for examination being explained in your Commentary as mere *non-historic* generalities, I shall unite them together under a primary main head : the two last, being *historic*, and susceptible of historic as well as internal testing, in detail, under a second.

I. THE NON-HISTORIC.

1. Now here, 1st, as to the *four primary Seals*, and their intended significancy, as you affirm, of the Gospel's continuous triumphant progress, and continuity too of wars, famines, and pestilences, in the future of the world's

¹ Prolegom. pp. 248, 249.

history, even to the end, let me say I should really have thought that the fact of these opening visions being under the form of complex impersonations, with sundry specific, and in one case at least (that of the 3d Seal) very singular characteristics, of the persons or things impersonated, might of itself have sufficed to warn off any expositor of discernment from supposing the intent of each to be so simple as you state: independently of the fatal objection already urged by me, of the so-called revelations under the Seals being, on such an hypothesis of their intended meaning, a mere repetition of certain points in Christ's previous prophecy on Mount Olivet; and consequently, at the time of St. John's exile in Patmos, no revelations at all. "The horses and their riders," you say generally, "are the various aspects of the Divine dispensations, which should come upon the earth preparatory to the great day of the Lord's coming."¹ A curious definition of them, "Divine dispensations," in the plural; when expressly declared to be not consecutive, but intermixed continually, as together constituting one and the same general intended providential dispensation in the world's history, subsequently to the first preaching of the Gospel. And again, (and this is what I shall have more to dwell on,) "their common feature," you say, "is personification; in the representation of processions of events by *the impersonation of their leading features*."² Will this statement of their leading features being impersonated really apply in each case, according to your interpretation of the Seals? Let us see.

Take, then, to begin, the 1st Seal. Here, in two closely-printed columns, you find yourself forced to fence a little as you explain your application of the symbol. The descriptive passages in Ps. xlv. and Apoc. xix. are, you say, necessarily suggested by it; each of those two parallel

¹ Comment. p. 611.

² *Ib.* 616.

passages referring to *Christ*, as the rider intended. So in the Psalm; "Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O most mighty; in thy majesty ride prosperously: thine arrows are sharp in the midst of the king's enemies." And in Apoc. xix. 11; "Behold, a white horse, and He that sate upon him was called Faithful and True," &c. But beware, you tell us, of supposing the rider here to be similarly Christ:—"It is only a symbol of His victorious power, the embodiment of His advancing kingdom." Now, the discrepancies of the 1st Seal's symbolized rider from those in the other two prophetic passages are sufficiently obvious; and such as to warn us off from even this modified similarity of interpretation. Wherefore, we naturally ask, is there no notice here of the *sword* girded on the rider? Wherefore the *bow* alone specified as in his hand, without the arrows, so as in the Psalm?—not to allude to the much greater discrepancies in detail from the description in Apoc. xix.¹ But the grand general objection that forces itself on the mind, in opposition to your view of the symbol of the first Apocalyptic Seal, arises out of what is said of the rider's "going forth conquering and to conquer." For this implies, as you say, a visible uninterrupted course of conquest:² such as, in fact, the prophetic descriptions of Christ, just noted from Ps. xlv. and Apoc. xix., foreshadowed; referring, as they do, both the one and the other, to His ultimate triumph

¹ I have noticed these discrepancies very fully in my Commentary on the 1st Seal in my "Hore Apocalypticæ;" and I am glad to see that various expositors since, of other views of the prophecy than my own, have recognised them as decisive against identifying the two riders. *E.g.*, in the Futurist Mr. W. Kelly's recently-published "Apocalyptic Exposition."

² So in your Comment., p. 611: "The whole imagery of this first Seal speaks of victory." Again, p. 612: "*Permanent* (as well as *final*) victory is here imported, on the part of that kingdom against which the gates of hell shall not prevail." No doubt, *final* victory.

over every enemy, on the final establishment of His earthly kingdom. But how can this consist with what is so prominently set forth in the subsequent Apocalyptic revelations respecting the mighty opposition to His kingdom, in the intervening times between St. John and the consummation, and oppression and persecution of Christ's saints; whether by the inhabitants of the earth generally, against whom the cry of the martyrs is figured as rising up to heaven from under the altar in the 5th Seal; or, yet more specially, by the Beast from the sea or abyss; who is set forth as triumphantly warring against Christ's saints, and at length murdering His sackcloth-robed Witnesses, after long reduction of them to the very smallest number for a sufficient testimony? Was it not a period at which they who were baptized on the Christian side were baptized as it were on the side of men dead, so far as this world was concerned? ¹ The objection seems to me fatal.

But to proceed; and passing over *the 2d Seal*,—of which, however, I must say, that its language seems distinctly enough to indicate *civil war* among the inhabitants of the earth (the *Roman earth*),² not *Wars from without*, as

¹ Βαπτίζομενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν. (1 Cor. xv. 29.) I have often marvelled at the perplexity exhibited alike by expositors ancient and modern, (yourself included, and your favourite grammarian Winer, too,) in the explanation of this passage. The only difficulty is in the ὑπὲρ. If it may mean, as notoriously it may, *on behalf of, on the side of*,—a sense specially applicable to βαπτίζομενοι as a term of *Christian military profession*,—then the apostle himself solves all other difficulties by what he says of his dying daily, &c.: so marking the Christian cause as a life of death in this world, such as in fact the very baptismal immersion, (Rom. vi. 3, 4,) especially in those days of persecution, symbolized; as well as death of non-existence in the next, if, Christ having failed to rise, there was to the Christian no resurrection.

² “To take peace from the earth,” such was declared the appointed office of the rider of the red horse, “and *that they should kill one another*.” On which you say, p. 613, “from the earth generally, *as ever*: not Judea; nor the Roman *orbis terrarum*; nor any special portion merely.” But in Apoc. xvii. 18, it is said of Babylon, or Rome, in association with the Beast from the sea or abyss, “the great city which hath dominion over the kings (τῶν

its subject,—let me stop more particularly to examine your view of *the 3d Seal*. On its opening we read thus:—“Behold, a black horse, and he that sat on it having a balance in his hand: and I heard a voice in the midst of the four living creatures saying, A chœnix of wheat for a denarius, and three chœnixes of barley for a denarius, and¹ see that thou hurt not (*μη ἀδικησης*) the oil and the wine.” “This is a symbol,” you say, “of *famine*.” Now you have had before you all my objections to this solution; showing it, according to the data given, to be nothing less than impossible. Nor on the preliminaries to this conclusion do you dispute my statements. The denarius you agree with me in taking as the measure at the time of a day-labourer’s wages; the chœnix, as a day’s sufficiency of grain for a man’s sustenance: moreover, that “barley, oil, and wine, conjointly with wheat, then formed (as in the East they still do) the ordinary sources of nourishment.”² Yet, admitting this, and that, according to the explanatory words of this Seal, neither was the wine or oil to be injuriously affected, while the price of barley was to be so moderate as that the labourer might get three days’ sustenance in barley bread for his wage of one day’s labour, you still persist, (though, I confess, once and again,³ with a hesitating and half-contradictory voice,) in

γης) of the earth:” where (p. 708) you too, notwithstanding your “as ever,” explain it as simply the Roman earth. So, too, in Apoc. xi. 10, where the same wild Beast from the sea, or abyss, is spoken of as in Apoc. xvii.; and where consequently the inhabitants of the earth (*της γης*), there also mentioned as adherents of the great city, Rome, are implied to be inhabitants of the same *Roman* earth, connected with the Beast.

¹ Mark the *and, και*; showing that the charge in the former clause is cognate in spirit to that in the latter; and consequently the former, as well as latter, a charge altogether alien from the infliction of famine.

² Comment. p. 614.

³ “The tendency of the voice (from the throne) is to check, or limit, the agency of the rider on the black horse; and to provide that, notwithstanding his errand, sustenance shall not fail.” “It is the mercy of God

expounding the whole as a symbolization of God's sore judgment of famine. Now, having vainly otherwise made my objections, let me, since the point is so important, (involving as it does the true solution not of the 3d Seal only, but by necessary consequence of the other three too that are associated with it,) let me endeavour to bring the question to a direct issue by a personal and practical application. Let me suppose then that in the district round Canterbury, or rather we will say throughout the whole county of Kent, there has been a notable failure in the *wheat* crop, so as to make its price some double the average; but that, at the same time, there has been more than a full crop of *barley*, a vastly greater breadth of land having been sown with it than usual: that the *hop* harvest too, for which your county is so famous, has been abundant; and the produce of the grazing farms such as to make milk and butter cheap. Suppose, I say, that under these circumstances you were to issue forth, in your well-known charitable and kindly spirit, an appeal to the proprietors and wealthier inhabitants of the district, calling their attention to the gravity of the circumstances. "Very dear," we will suppose you writing, "is the price of wheat; though no doubt barley and butter and milk and beer are cheap enough; so that the labouring man's wages, united with his wife's earnings, may together be of an amount to secure to themselves and their young family a sufficiency of those

tempering His judgments." "It is *Famine*, not sweeping men away by utter failure of the means of subsistence, but keeping them far below the ordinary standard of comfort; especially those who depend on their daily labour." So Comment., p. 614. Yet is the purport of the *whole* figuration made by you to be *famine*; God's sore judgment of famine; such as was to be one of the predicted signs, or forerunners, of Christ's second coming.

Let the reader compare this with the description of *real* famine, as given elsewhere in Scripture; *e.g.*, Deut. xxviii. 53-57; Lament. iv. 9, 10; &c.; or again with Josephus' account of that which raged within the city during the siege of Jerusalem; or, in modern days, with that by which Ireland was depopulated in 1846, 1847. Is it possible, after doing so, to persist in the belief of the 3d Seal's symbolization being one of famine?

necessaries and in part luxuries of life; there being no lack of employment for the labourer, or diminution of the usual wage. Yet, notwithstanding, I cannot but view this as an awful famine, such as to call for the pity and large charity of the wealthier classes in aid of the famishing (?) poor:—indeed as one of those famines told of by Christ as a sign of His coming being near at hand. And, as on the old Rogation Days, I would urge further the advisableness of our all gathering in sad procession and mourning garb¹ to our Cathedral; there, in that Mother Church of Christian England, to deprecate the present and the coming wrath of Heaven!”—Is the absurdity of such a proceeding by you, in such a case, very evident? Then, Mr. Dean, unless it can be shown that the case I have supposed, so far as regards the measure of want indicated among the labouring class, is essentially different from that figured in the Apocalyptic vision, (and such a difference I am persuaded cannot be shown,) there follows by necessary consequence the absurdity of any such interpretation of the 3d Apocalyptic Seal as that which would make it a symbolization of *famine*.

On your 4th Seal I do not think it needful to dwell, any more than on your 2d Seal. Suffice it to say, that, like your predecessors in the interpretation which explains it simply as a symbolization of *pestilence*, you give no reason either why the *aggravation* of wars and famines should be additionally noted, and that just as prominently in regard to their deadly agency as pestilence; especially after their supposed distinct figurations in the Seals previous:² nor again why there should be the *limitation* of it to “the

¹ So the *black* horse in vision.

² “And, when he had opened the 4th Seal, behold a livid pale horse, and he that sat on it whose name was Death; and Hades followed with him: and there was given to them power to kill on the fourth part of the earth with the sword, and with famine, and with pestilence, and with the wild beasts of the earth.”

fourth part of the earth," territorially; whereas there had been no such territorial limitation in the supposed ravages of the two previous plagues.¹—But I wish to hasten on to what you think it well to speak of distinctly, and by itself, as another grand point in the Seals your explanation of which is incontestable; in so much so indeed as to constitute it another "landmark" of true Apocalyptic interpretation;—I mean *the 6th Seal*.

2. Yet really, as regards your view of that 6th Seal's primary vision,² viz. as depicting not indeed the Lord's coming itself, but the signs of its imminent nearness, it seems to me that you have hardly placed it in a position for examination, because of the indistinctness of your explanation as to what that view of the Seal's figuration really is. "We all know," you say in your Prolegomena,³ "what the imagery of the 6th Seal means in the rest of Scripture." Now the imagery is that of the earth quaking, the stars falling from heaven, and the heaven itself being rolled away like a folded up scroll, amidst the consternation of the world's inhabitants, crying out, "The great day of the

¹ "Over the fourth part of the earth":—perhaps, you say, "owing to the fourfold division of these former [qu. four primary?] Seals"!! In the same way in the 2d Seal it might have been said, according to your half-suggested explanation, "to take peace from the *second* part of the earth;" and in the 5th Seal the cry of the martyrs have been against the inhabitants of the *fifth* part of the earth!

² I say its *primary* vision, because I have no doubt myself of the next following sealing and palm-bearing visions belonging also to the same 6th Seal, as its *secondary* part; there being here no mark of retrogression, or episodical amplification, or explanation; and so the natural explanation being that the 6th Seal's figuration continued onward (like its predecessors) to the opening of the next or 7th Seal.

³ Proleg. 249. Says Dr. S. R. Maitland, on the other hand; "Can any unbiassed reader doubt that this passage refers (not to the signs of the approach of, but) to the day of judgment?" I have entered so fully on this subject in my Comment on the 6th Seal, and in my Examination of the Futurist Scheme in the Appendix to Vol. IV. of my *Horæ Apoc.*, that I cannot do better than refer an inquirer to those criticisms.

Lamb's wrath is come, and who can stand." But you do not express yourself by any means clearly, as to what "the day of the Lord" is; whether the mere 24 hours of the day of His second coming, or, so as sundry futurist expositors interpret it, a much longer period, including almost a brief new dispensation.¹ Nor again do you explain the acceptation in which those symbols of elemental convulsions in the Seal are to be taken, whether *literally* or *figuratively*. At p. 620 of your Commentary you seem to understand them *literally*. "The whole earth," you say, "is broken up by a change as total as any of those previous ones which have prepared it for its present inhabitants." So of the *earth's* convulsions in the symbolization. And, if these be literal, like the geological convulsions that have occurred before in our planet's crust, how not the same literality of meaning to the falling stars from heaven, and rolling up and vanishing away of the firmamental heaven itself? In which case where could there be any inhabitants of the earth left, previously to Christ's second actual

¹ In order to make out your view of the "day of the Lord,"—whether as the day literally of Christ's second personal coming, which event we read is to be in a moment, in the twinkling of the eye, and like the lightning flash, instantaneous,—or whether as a time of longer duration, including that of certain premonitory signs for awhile before, and that of certain results after,—I have consulted your Comment on 1 Thess. iv. 17, 2 Thess. ii. 2, 2 Pet. iii. 10, as well as your Apocalyptic Exposition, but in vain. At one time you seem to take it in one sense, at another time in another. *E.g.*, on 1 Thess. v. 2 you speak of its suddenness as in a moment; on 2 Thess. ii. 2, as the period during which "the day of grace was closed." Surely, speaking so often of it as you do, and entering so largely as it does into your Exposition, you ought to have defined your view of it very clearly.

For the large duration ascribed to it by certain Futurist expositors I may refer to the Rev. James Kelly's Apocalyptic Exposition "in the light of the *day of the Lord*;" or to the very recent Apocalyptic Exposition of a writer of the same name, but quite unconnected I believe, Mr. W. Kelly, of Guernsey; of which latter I have given an abstract in the 5th Edition of my *Horæ Apocalypticæ*, just published.

coming, to utter that cry of consternation? Moreover, as I have urged in my own Comment on the Seal, were actual elemental convulsions intended, such as we have reason to expect as the accompaniment of Christ's second coming, we might surely expect to have that of *the earth's conflagration by fire* prominent here, as it is most prominent in St. Peter's striking description of the event; not to speak of the very different accompaniment of the saints' resurrection, to meet the Lord in the air. The sense here must needs, I think, be figurative; and, if so, figurative of political revolution and change. Such in fact is the case generally in those prophecies in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, and Matt. xxiv., which you yourself refer to by way of illustration. They are spoken of indeed as signs of "the day of the Lord," or of "the Lord's coming": but in the sense of the day of His *providential coming*; whether for the overthrow of Babylon, Nineveh, Egypt, or, as you yourself say, in reference to Christ's prophecy in Matt. xxiv., of Jerusalem.¹ However, as regards your own view of the Seal, until you have distinctly declared yourself on the two questions that I have spoken of, viz. the intent, in your judgment, of "the day of the Lord," and intent, whether literal or figurative, of its symbols of elemental convulsion, you seem to me, as I said before, not even to be in a position to challenge inquiry into your explanation of it.

II. Now for the two grand HISTORIC EXPLANATIONS in your Commentary: viz. 1st, that concerning the DRAGON and WOMAN in Apoc. xii.; 2dly, those concerning the BEAST in Apoc. xiii., xvii., xi.

1. Of these the *former* is a passage in the prophecy which you have spoken of as your *third* touchstone passage

¹ Prolegom. p. 253.

of true Apocalyptic interpretation; viz., that which contained the figurings of the persecution by the seven-headed Dragon of the sun-clothed travelling Woman, Apoc. xii. And here, with the numerous and most grave difficulties and objections before you that beset every step of the explanation which construes it as meant of Christ's literal birth, persecutions, and ascension, you really seem to me willingly to ignore them; for you say nothing worth the notice in answer. The following are the questions that you ought to have replied to before the adoption of your explanation. Where is the Jewish Old Testament Church represented as the mother of Jesus Christ?¹ How in a composite symbol, like that of the woman and her child, can the child with any propriety be construed literally, and the woman figuratively?² How could the Jewish Church be designated as in heaven, at the time of Jesus Christ's birth? If the *political* heaven, how so at a time when Judea had become a subject province of the Roman Empire? If the *spiritual* heaven of God's presence, and his saints' aspirations, how can this consist with what we know to have been the irreligious state of the Jewish Church and nation at the time referred to?³ Moreover how could the seven-headed

¹ "The whole symbolism (regarding the Woman) points to the Church, the bride of God, and of course, from the circumstances afterwards related, the Old Testament Church;" "at least," you add, "at the beginning of the vision." So at p. 664 of your Commentary. In your Prolegom. p. 257, not quite consistently, you say; "The Church's identification in the eyes of the seer is rendered unmistakable by the scene opening with the appearance of the woman and the serpent, and enmity between him and her seed;" as if the Woman were *Eve*.

² Not a word on this in your Commentary.

³ All you say at first of the heaven here meant is as follows. "Heaven here is manifestly not only the show-place of the visions as seen by the seer, but has a substantial place in the vision; being (verse 7) contrasted with the earth," p. 664. Afterwards, on verse 7, you explain it, we shall see, as the heaven of God's presence. But, not a word as to the reason of the Woman's position there.

Dragon, or Satan animating and acting in the Roman heathen empire,¹ be designated as also there, coincidentally:² or how again, while there, as drawing with his tail the third part of the stars of heaven?³ How could Jesus Christ's ascension to God's throne, if construed literally, be spoken of as made from heaven, not from earth?⁴ What was the war in heaven which took place after His ascension; and how the result of that war the seven-headed Dragon's dejection from heaven; symbolizing as you say it did the Roman heathen empire, at a time prior to, or coincident

¹ So you explain the Dragon, and I doubt not rightly, Comment. p. 664.

² At p. 666 you attempt to explain the Dragon's figured place in heaven by reference to Job i. ii. and Zech. iii., where Satan personally (not as inspiring and acting in Roman Heathendom) is spoken of as accusing Job, and Joshua the high-priest, before God: also to Luke x. 18; where however the meaning is evidently different, being symbolic of earthly power and supremacy. His fall from thence in the subsequent verse 7 of this vision you construe to mean "his casting down from the office of accuser in heaven:" "his voice being heard before God no more; for the day of acceptance in Christ Jesus has dawned:" all this, you say, being the effect of Christ's justifying work, as pleaded by Him before God for His people.

Yet, 1st, Michael, who fights with and casts down the Dragon, and so stops this his accusing of the saints in heaven, is said by you to be not Christ, but a created angel. 2. In the saints' subsequent song of triumph, verse 10, Satan is spoken of in the present partic. as *still κατηγορων*: and so too 1 Pet. v. 8; where his *then* acting the same part against the saints is implied in his title, "your *adversary* the Devil;" the original being *αντιδικος*, a word borrowed from the accusations in a court of justice. (Compare Luke xii. 58, xviii. 3, and also Rom. viii. 34.)—3. As regards that ejection of Satan from the heavenly place in which his associate angels (here meant, verse 9, you suppose) participated, it is sufficiently clear from other Scripture that it took place long before; indeed before man's creation. Compare Jude 6.

³ You here say nothing of "the third part:" but elsewhere (p. 634) explain it as an ordinal in this vision of *indefinite* meaning.—As to "the stars" you only suggest from Arethas, as hinted above, that by them are meant the associate angels in Satan's original rebellion. So p. 665.

⁴ No notice in your Commentary of this objection. Yet, somewhat curiously, your own language unconsciously expresses it, *ibid.* "The Son of the Woman was taken up to heaven," you say, not *from* heaven; "and sate on the right hand of God."

with, the Romans' destruction of Jerusalem, and when consequently it was quite at its height of power?¹ Again, if the woman's flight into the wilderness be meant, as you suggest, of the Christian Church's flight at that time to Pella, how comes it that the woman having been the Jewish Church when travailing with the man-child, should have become metamorphosed in the interim into the Christian Church, without any notice of the change; and this though pointedly and altogether identified with that woman, by the designation, "the woman that brought forth the man-child?" How, yet once more, that her stay in Pella should have answered to the predicted period of the 1260 days of the mystical woman's exile in the wilderness?²—Not to one of these questions, Mr. Dean, do you offer anything that can be called effective answer, or explanation. And can he

¹ The objection thus arising from Satan's connexion throughout this vision with the Roman heathen empire, as figured, you admit, in his seven-headed Draconic form, is here, as before, entirely overlooked by you. See Notes 1 and 2, p. 33, *supra*.

² At p. 669 of your Commentary you say; "I am disposed to interpret the Woman's flight into the wilderness of the Church's gradual withdrawal from Jerusalem and Judea; finally consummated by the flight to the mountains on the approaching siege, as commanded by Christ." But at p. 670, when discussing the 1260 days of her exile, you *tacitly* seem to bid farewell to Pella and its mountains; recognising 1260 days as meant perhaps to signify a long time: possibly even 1260 *years*; *i. e.* as on the year-day scale; or even more.* After much doubting and various surmisings on this point, and as to the main intent of the Woman's or Church's long figured term of exile in the wilderness, you mention my own view (p. 670), only to misrepresent it; as if explaining the Woman to be Christ's invisible spiritual Church of true-hearted disciples distinctively: and, so misrepresented, you speak of it as non-accordant with historic fact. Then finally you just hint, as if your own original idea, what is really the one advocated by me in the Hore Apoc., viz., that the Woman may be meant to symbolize "the *true visible Church*," as, after all, perhaps the right view. Only my definition of it is more carefully and guardedly expressed, as the *true visible united Catholic Church*. See my 4th Letter.

* See Note * p. 41, *infra*.

be a wise master-builder who, in the case of a passage like this, which he himself declares to lie at the very foundation of his system, either ignores such crushing objections to its validity; or else, while admitting that he cannot solve them, insists with not the less confidence and positiveness on his explanation as true; and this in profest contravention of a counter-interpretation in which, as I will here venture to say, though in anticipation of my fourth Letter, there is not one of the difficulties left unanswered?

2. I now turn to the next point in your Commentary; (it is the last on which I think it needful to enter at all particularly in the way of critical examination;) viz. to your exposition of the *seven-headed ten-horned wild Beast* of Apoc. xiii., xvii., and xi.:—for *the Beast from the abyss* of Apoc. xvii. and xi. is recognised by you, as well as by myself,¹ as mainly identical with the *Beast from the sea* of Apoc. xiii.; though, in your case, with certain notable differences

¹ So p. 701 of your Commentary; “The identity of the scarlet Beast of Apoc. xvii. with that mentioned before in Apoc. xiii. is plain:” also p. 672, on Apoc. xiii. 3; “The period now treated of is the same as that during which the Woman sits on the Beast;” *i. e.* as depicted in Apoc. xvii.

Like me you urge the argument from Apoc. xix. 20,—“The Beast (evidently the same *Beast from the abyss* that had just previously been described in Apoc. xvii.,) was taken, and *the false Prophet that wrought miracles before Him*,”—compared with Apoc. xiii. 14, which speaks of the *lambskin-covered Beast*, or *false Prophet* (Matt. vii. 15), doing miracles before the *Beast from the sea*. This, conjointly with the seven-headed form ascribed alike to the one and the other, you regard as decisive on the question. So Comment. p. 701.

As regards *myself* it should be observed that, while having no doubt as to the self-same *Roman Popedom* being distinctly figured alike in the one and the other vision, I consider the vision in Apoc. xvii. to have depicted the Beast at a later epoch in its history than Apoc. xiii.; the latter having reference to the time of its rise, the former to the time shortly before its end. Hence on the one but one name, it may have been, of blasphemy; (so *το ονομα*, in some good MSS.;) while, in the other, the whole body was full of names of blasphemy.

As regards *yourself* the inconsistency of the *identity* which you predicate

in regard of the headships respectively, of which more hereafter.—This reference of the symbol of the Beast mainly¹ to the Roman Papal empire constitutes your Exposition, in regard of that integral and large part of the prophecy, an *historical* Exposition; and subject consequently, so far, to the stringent testing of accordance, or non-accordance, between the prophetic descriptions and the historic facts supposed to be referred to, as well as to that of *internal* evidence also. Somewhat inconsistent certainly seems your adoption here of the *historical*, indeed *continuously historical*, system of exposition, after your repeated denunciations of all continuously historical systems of Apocalyptic interpretation;² and even yet more so, in my opinion, because of your making this large part of the prophecy definitely historical, while construing most that precedes as an enunciation of mere vague, unconnected, unhistorical generalities.³ But the advantage of the double testing here results to us; and so we proceed, with this advantage, to our examination into the truth of this important part of your Exposition.

As the Beast referred to is, you tell us, the same (though, as before said, with certain differences,) alike in Apoc. xiii., xvii., and xi., we have the various chief particulars stated, or figured, respecting it in those three chapters to compare with each other and with history; alike as regards the Beast's *heads, horns, character, doings, duration, name, number, and end*;—its *heads*, or rather its *two last heads*, most especially. I shall endeavour to give a connected

between the two Beasts, with the *differences* which you also predicate will be afterwards noticed by me.

¹ See Note 3, p. 10.

² So Prolegom., 248, 249, 255, 256, &c.

³ A similar charge of inconsistency applies of course to Wordsworth's and other such Apocalyptic Expositions: which, while interpreting Babylon and the Beast *historically* and *definitely*, as symbols of the Papal Roman empire, explains the rest of the prophecy as for the most part mere vague allegory.

abstract of the views propounded by you on these various points, in your several comments on what is stated of the Beast severally in one or other of the chapters alluded to; and this, according to the great importance of the subject, very copiously and at large:—though hard indeed is my task in doing this; so much is there in your Exposition of inconsistencies, self-contradictions, and indeed unintelligibilities. However I will here do my best; and shall give my abstract or paraphrase of the whole, with a view to the greater pointedness of my argument, *as written by yourself in the first person*: there being interwoven certain hintings of suspected objections, such as can scarcely but have suggested themselves to an Expositor of fair intelligence, at least if duly acquainted with his subject, and not writing in a hurry; together with the answers, if any, inferable from your Commentary. And to this indeed references will be given on every particular: in evidence that on no one point is any unwarranted statement made by me; any one that is justly liable to the charge of misrepresentation.

The following then is a sketch of your Exposition of the Apocalyptic Beast; and the Apocalyptic prophecies therewith connected, as presented to us in your Book; together with certain self-suggested suspicions of objections, supposed to occur in soliloquy with your own self while elaborating it.

* * * * *

Secum loquitur Decanus Cantuariensis.

“Fundamental is my view of the BEAST as in its totality, so as most German interpreters expound it, a generic symbol of the *World-Power* of every age, opposed to God and Christ. For both by its *likeness*, when first seen rising from the sea, in part to a lion, in part to a bear, in part to a leopard, there was shown evidently the aggregation in the Apocalyptic Beast of all of Daniel’s three first great mundane empires,

so symbolized respectively;—the Babylonian, Persian, and Greek, as well as Roman.¹ And again, from the Angel's explanation of the Beast's *seven heads*, as figuring seven kings (*βασιλεις*), *i.e.* kingdoms, (so as in Dan. vii. 17, 23, compared together,) of which the first five had fallen in St. John's time, that being the sixth, it was said, which then existed, it seemed inferable that there were included in the symbol, besides Daniel's four empires, the two earlier mundane empires also of Egypt and Assyria: of which six the Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, and Grecian had all fallen ere the commencement of the Christian era; leaving the supremacy, or then dominant headship of the Beast, to the sixth or Roman power.²

“Such is my explanation of the Beast generally, and its six first heads. For I repudiate the explanation which would regard the Beast's seven heads as signifying *seven different successive executive headships*, or *forms of government*, at *Rome itself*: even as if the seven symbolized *βασιλεις* were *ascripti glebæ*, or bound one and all to the same *seven-hilled locality*; so as Mede, and after him Elliott, would have it, accordantly with the Angel's secondary explanation of the Beast's seven heads as symbols of Rome's seven hills. Though heads of the Beast, I would have this their secondary meaning apply only to the Woman sitting on it in the vision of Apoc. xvii., not to the Beast itself;³ however unnatural may seem to some this estrangement of half the declared double significaney of its own heads from its own self. The

¹ Comment. p. 672.

² Comment. p. 705.

³ So *ibid.* “As far as the reference to the *Woman* is concerned they are *hills*, on which she sits. As far as the reference to the Beast is concerned they are *kings*;—not kings over the Woman, or kings of the city symbolized by her, but kings in a totally different relation, *viz.*, that to the *Beast* of which they are heads: . . . which Beast is not the Roman empire, but a general symbol of secular antichristian power.” Is not this a little of the argument in a circle; taking for granted what should be proved?

expression *fallen*, applied to some of the heads, ("five have fallen," *επεσαν*), I judge to be quite inapplicable to mere changes of government in the same empire; and only referable to kingdoms, or kings, violently overthrown.¹ Besides which I cannot of course forget that, were we not to make this severance from the Beast itself of the seven-hilled local significance of the symbol, it would be impossible to maintain our generic view of the Beast, as the aggregate of all the successive great antichristian secular powers of successive ages, which had one after another risen up, and in St. John's time for the most part fallen, in *different parts of the world*; which view I have already laid down as a fundamental point with me in my exposition of the Beast.

"And then, further, as it is one preliminary point of strong conviction with me that the Beast was a symbol generically of the World-power opposed to God and Christ, from the beginning to the end of time, so it is also my fixt and foregone conclusion, as expressed in the Prolegomena to my Commentary on chap. ii. of St. Paul's second Epistle to the Thessalonians, that the latest form of this World-power (the same that answers alike to the Apocalyptic Beast's eighth head, and to Daniel's little horn and Paul's man of sin) is yet to come.² Thus the great question now with me for

¹ So Comment. p. 705. This point will be referred to again, and the objection answered, in the vindication of my own explanation of the passage in a subsequent Letter.

² The Apocalyptic Beast, you say p. 706, in his 8th and last form (Apoc. xvii. 11), "is the *ultimate* antichristian power; the same that is prefigured by the *little horn* of Daniel, and expressly announced by St. Paul (as the *man of sin*) in 2 Thess. ii. 3."

Your conclusion in regard to this prophecy of St. Paul's is as follows. "The *ανομος*, in the full prophetic sense, is not yet come; . . . though the *μυστηριον της ανομίας* is still working, and much advanced in its working; the *κατεχον* (*i.e.* the fabric of human polity, and those that rule that polity) still hindering . . . In the Papacy, where so many of the prophetic features are combined, we see as it were a standing embodiment and type of the *final Antichrist*. . . . We look for this *Man of Sin* to appear immediately

solution, all in consistency with these my two fundamental points of conviction, is as to the Beast's seventh head; and, as preliminary to the rise of the seventh, what, and when,

before the coming of the Lord, as the final and central embodiment of that *ανομία*,—that resistance to God and God's law,—which has been for these many centuries fermenting under the crust of human society; . . . whether to be expected *personally*, as one embodiment of evil, (and both ancient interpretation and the world's history point that way,) or otherwise.—So in the Proleg. to your Comment. on 2 Thess. pp. 67, 68.

While admitting the many points of correspondence between the *Papal power*, and the *Man of sin*, as depicted in this prophecy, you at p. 66 of those Prolegomena specify the two following points of what you judge to be decisive difference; the one as regards *character*, the other *chronology* and *history*.

1st. "Instead of exalting himself above all that is called god, or is worshipped, (so as the Man of sin was to do,) the Pope's abject adoration of, and submission to, *λεγόμενοι θεοὶ* and *σεβασμάτα*, has been ever one of his most notable peculiarities."—A strange assertion! Who is it, let me ask, that *makes* departed men to be *saints*, and *objects of worship*, by his acts of canonization? Who but the Pope? And which is the more exalted,—he who makes, or he who is (ideally) made? Even as regards *God himself*, does not the Pope profess to make Him; yea, and to give all his priests, as delegated from himself, similar power to make Him, through the transubstantiation of the consecrated wafer? And if, after this, he abjectly adores the one or the other, what is it but one of the most marvellous acts of systematic and characteristic hypocrisy? Let me beg you, Mr. Dean, to consider the very illustrative Papal medals on this subject, engraved in the 3d volume of my *Horæ Apoc.* at p. 168 of my 4th edition, or p. 180 of the 5th.

2dly. "If the Papacy be Antichrist, then has the manifestation been made and endured now for nearly 1,500 years; and yet that day of the Lord is not come, which by the terms of our prophecy such manifestation is immediately to precede."—A statement equally strange and inaccurate with the former! Pray, when was the Papacy *in its proper character* developed; *i. e.* on the self-asserted principle of the Bishop of Rome being Christ's, and so God's, plenipotentiary Vicegerent on earth; and with the kings of the Western Roman empire (in its last form of the mixed iron and clay of the feet of the image) recognising him in that character? Not earlier (see my Vol. iii. Part iv. chaps. 4 and 5 on this subject) than the middle or end of the 6th century. Again, where does this prophecy say that the Man of sin's *manifestation* (*first* manifestation) was immediately to precede Christ's second coming? On the contrary was not the duration of the Man of sin, or Little horn, or Apocalyptic Beast of Apoc. x. expressly predicted to be $3\frac{1}{2}$ times, or 1260 days; as to which you admit in your Apocalyptic Commentary that it is a term of time not to be taken literally; but probably to be a long, long period, whether 1260 years on

the fall of the Beast's sixth, or Roman Imperial head, that same that was in existence at the time of the visions in Patmos. And I must confess that difficulties here press on me at every step, alike from prophecy and history.

The explanation I would first propound of the falling of the Beast's sixth head, and rise of its seventh, is that these two events answered to the fall of heathenism, and rise of Christianity to dominant power, in the Roman empire; a dominancy begun under Constantine and the Christian emperors succeeding him,¹ and perpetuated, from some two or three centuries later, under *professedly* Christian Popes.² For I here take for granted that the Beast's sixth head had not previously fallen. The famous Diocletianic change of the Roman constitution and government, some thirty years before Constantine, which is so prominent in the pages of Gibbon's History, and which Elliott has set forth in equal prominence as the fulfilment of the predicted fall of the Beast's sixth head, and rise of the seventh, in his Apocalyptic

the year-day principle, or otherwise? See Comm. pp. 655, 670, 671.* And then further, with reference to the time of the Lord's coming for the Man of sin's destruction, there is to be considered (as noted in the 5th edition of my Horæ) the adjustment to the 1260 prophetic days, or right relative placing, of Daniel's additional 75 days of the "time of the end."

Such misrepresentation of Scripture prophecy by a Scripture Commentator is most regrettable: not to speak of the great but inferior error, exhibited in this your Commentary on St. Paul's prophecy, of the ignoring of notorious Papal law and doctrine; and also really of gross self-contradiction.

¹ Comment. pp. 672, 706.

² See the Note p. 40, on the real time of the rise of the Papacy, as the great predicted Antichristian power.

* At p. 655 you say that all the several periods of the 3½ times, 42 months, 1260 days, predicated of the Beast's duration, the sackcloth-robed witnesses' witnessing, and Woman's, or faithful professing Church's, exile in the wilderness, (as also of the little horn of Dan. vii. 25,) are equal:—"equal they certainly seem to be." At p. 670 you make them long periods; at p. 671 even longer perhaps than 1260 years: the woman's invisibility in the wilderness having probably begun from the time of the intrusion into the Church of evil men, and evil doctrines and schisms.

Commentary, I reject on the ground before stated of the inapplicability of the word *fallen* to such changes of governmental headships:—though otherwise, I must admit, it would well suit two of the prophetic indications here: viz., 1st, that of the Angel's statement that the seventh head would be but of brief continuance; (“when it cometh it must continue, *ολιγον*, a little space;”) and 2dly, that of the Roman heathen power, as impersonated in the Dragon of Apoc. xii., appearing at the prefigured time of its last actings, and last persecution of the Christian Church, with just seven heads, even as if the seventh had *ere then* risen, *ere then* attached itself to the Roman Beast.¹ And, putting aside the Diocletianic solution, I seem forced to regard the fall of the Beast's sixth head (whatever may be said of the rise of the seventh) as fulfilled in the fall of heathenism under Constantine:—though, in truth, my own criticism on *επεσαν* might here perhaps be not unreasonably urged against me, seeing that the *Roman Empire* itself still continued, and the change was only a change of *its religion*; and seeing too, should the wars which ushered in that change be alleged by me, as showing the *violence* of the overthrow of the old religion,² that there had been the same accompaniment of war in the case of certain previous constitutional changes of government at Rome, such as I have refused to recognise as fulfilment of the falling and rising of other heads of the Beast; *e. g.* in the times of Tarquin and Augustus.—Moreover difficulties still graver, I see, encompass the idea of the Beast's seventh head originating at that same time. Could a *Christian* headship, as begun under the Constan-

¹ With just seven, I say; not with the superadded cicatrice of an old previous 7th, so as in the case of the *Beast from the sea*, the Dragon's successor, as it is said, in respect alike of his throne and power:—a cicatrice implying that the new 7th head, then visible on the Beast, was the 8th in order of time and succession.

² See p. 39, *supra*.

tino-Theodosian Christian line of emperors, be figured with any symbolic propriety as a head of the *Antichristian Beast*? As well, I can conceive it said by an objector, with not unwarranted causticity of humour, might England, with its present orthodox profession of Christianity, and a Christian Archbishop, and *Christian Dean* too, at its mother Church of Canterbury, be called a head of the Beast! A partial answer indeed to this objection may, I think, be inferred from what the Angel said of the Beast, as that which, at some certain epoch, then future, would be *non-existent*; even as if the essential bestial spirit would be during that certain time suspended. And such was the case in the Constantino-Theodosian times. But then, if we apply this to the Constantino-Theodosian Christian times, so as in fact I do primarily,¹ ought not the Beast to be regarded as *headless* during that interval of *non-existence*, according to all proprieties of symbolic representation?—What then (though I have not expressed this in my Commentary) if we shift forward the time of the Beast's seventh head rising, and make it synchronize with the rise of the Roman Popedom? No doubt we should then get rid not only of this difficulty, but also of the difficulty arising out of the conjunction of the *Christian Imperial Government* and subsequent *Antichristian Papal Government*, as one and the same seventh head

¹ "I regard this 7th head as the *Christian empire*, beginning with Constantine; during whose time the Beast in his proper essence, and fulness of opposition to God and His saints, ceases to be." Again; "Of the Beast which was, *and is not*," the peculiar power and essence seem suspended while the Empire is Christian by profession." So on xvii. 7, 8, p. 706. Also on xiii. 3, p. 671; "The statement, *And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded unto death*, seems to represent the Roman Pagan Empire, which having been long a head of the Beast was to all appearance exterminated: '*and the stroke of his death was healed*,' in the establishment of the *Christian Roman empire*. The period now treated of is the same, introduced here by anticipation, during which the Woman (which, on xvii. 3, you explain, p. 700, as distinctly '*Papal*, not Pagan, Rome') sits on the Beast, and guides it."

of the Beast :¹ a difficulty which to any intelligent reader must be obvious ; though indeed, as before, I have not myself even hinted it. Yet, even so, there would remain to my theory many hard, if not insuperable difficulties. The Beast's seventh head was only to last, the Angel said, "a little space." Now the standard of length or brevity of duration must be here of course that of the time of the Beast's other heads' continuance. How then, considering that the longest of all the Beast's previous heads, whether the Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Greek, Hea-then, or Roman, had been far, far shorter, could the 1200 or 1300 years of the Roman Popedom be called "a little space?" My suggested parallel passage from Herodotus iv. 81, who refers to an observation made by him just but 29 chapters before in *the same Book* of his History, as *ολιγον* τι, "some little" before, as if justificatory of *such* an interpretation of the Angel's "little space," I cannot in sober earnest insist on.² A critical reader will almost think me joking in so doing.—And then too history comes in with its difficulties. It tells of the mighty Gothic irruptions in the 5th and 6th centuries, and of the violent overthrow of the Western Roman Empire, (of the Empire itself ; not a mere constitutional change in it of government, or religion,) under them. It tells too of the formation synchronically of ten, or about ten, Romano-Gothic kingdoms, on the platform of the same Western Empire : whose kings, after desolating the old Imperial Rome, submitted themselves in superstitious awe (a submission continued for many centuries after-

¹ See the Note previous.

² Comment., p. 706 : "The idea given is rather that of *duration*, than of *non-duration*." So you say ; and follow up that strange statement by the citation from Herodotus. You refer also to 1 Pet. i. 6, v. 10, "having suffered *a while*," *ολιγον* : which, of course, referring as it does to the sufferings of Christians individually during the time of this earthly life, is short as compared with the coming eternal life of joy ; and so still less to your point.

wards) to the yoke of Papal Rome, as the head of all Churches in Christendom ; and to its bishops, as the divinely appointed Vicegerents of God on earth. Singularly did these seem to answer both to what is told of the ten toes of mixed iron and clay in Daniel's symbolic image, of the ten horns of Daniel's fourth Beast dominated over by its contemporary little horn, and of the ten horns too of the Apocalyptic Beast, in that stage of its existence depicted in Apoc. xiii., when it rose from the sea, under its seventh head ; the which headship and era I am supposing to have been that of the Roman Popedom. And, if the prefigured 7th head was the Papal, can it be that those ten Romano-Gothic kings, so associated with the Popedom's rise in history, were not what the ten associated horns of the Apocalyptic Beast in prophecy, under that its 7th head, signified ? All this however I ignore,—totally ignore,—in my Apocalyptic Commentary. Is it asked, *Why* ? Because (is not this the real answer ?) *I want the ten predicted kings for my eighth head* ; to the interpretation of which as post-Papal, still future, and answering to the little horn of Daniel's fourth Beast, I am almost irrevocably committed.¹ Yet can I be quite at ease in the belief that that prophecy, or series of prophecies, which, as the revealing Angel expressly said, was to show to St. John the grand future fortunes of the Church, and Roman world connected with it, similarly ignored them all ?

¹ “ These are ten kingdoms, which (as indicated in Dan. vii. 23) shall arise out of the 4th of the four great kingdoms ; ten European Powers which in the last time, in concert with and subjection to the Anti-christian power, shall make war against Christ.” So Comment., p. 707. After which you say :—“ In the precise number and form here indicated they have not yet arisen. It would not be difficult to point out the elements and already consolidating shapes of most of them ; but in precise number we have them not as yet.” You add ; “ What changes in *Europe* may bring them into the required form it is not for us to say :” forgetting your former declaration under the Seals that the Apocalyptic earth was not the *Roman* earth, but the whole earthly globe. This, however, is perpetually forgotten by you. See Note 2, p. 25.

“Let me turn from these sad difficulties and inconsistencies, connected with my *Papal* explanation of the Beast’s seventh head, to my *post-Papal* view of its eighth or last head; hoping that here at least there may be such self-consistency, and strong *internal* evidence of truth, (for in this there is fortunately no opportunity for *historic* testing, seeing that I suppose it to be figured of a state of the Beast still future,) as may help in some degree to countervail the disappointment of my quest of good evidence of fulfilment in what went before with regard to my explanation of the Beast’s seventh head as meant mainly of its Papal headship. But can that hope be realized? Alas, 1st, the hard objection here meets me, that it is this 8th head which the revealing Angel said was to answer to the Beast as revived from its “is not” state;—in direct and flat contradiction to my explanation of its “resuscitation” from the “is not” state as taking place under the Beast’s *seventh*, or *professedly Christian*, head.¹ Again, 2dly, it is described as *ἐκ τῶν ἑπτα*, “of the seven :” a statement which in truth I know not how to explain, consistently with my hypothesis, except as an intimation that the Beast proper, or Beast under its eighth and last head, is “the successor and result of the seven previous heads, following and springing out of them.”² But will the Greek (*αὐτος ἐκ τῶν ἑπτα ἐστίν*) properly bear that sense:—the substantive verb, with *ἐκ* before the numeral, bear the simple sense of *following after*?³ And, if so, did it

¹ So, as noted before, pp. 672, 673 of your Commentary. See Note p. 43.

² Comment., p. 706.

³ Compare Mark xiv. 20:—“*εἰς ἐκ τῶν δωδεκα*, one of the twelve :” also Joh. vi. 71, *εἰς ὧν ἐκ τῶν δωδεκα*, and Luke xxii. 3. Such is the most usual meaning of the Greek phrase. And, so construed, the expression here would mean, “one of the first seven,” as being one of that *number*.—Or else it may mean “one of them,” in the sense of *one with them in character*; so as twice over in I Joh. ii. 19, “They went out from us because *they were not of us* :” *οὐκ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν*. It is this latter sense which I have settled on as that of the Apocalyptic passage, and have so given it in my last (5th) Edition, Vol. iii. p. 132; the Beast in its Papal and

need an Angel's revelation to make St. John understand that the eighth head would be, in order of succession, subsequent to the previous seven?—Then, 3dly, as to the Beast's *seat and throne of empire* under this his eighth and last head, how can we explain it consistently with the prophecy? In Apoc. xvii. 16 the Beast from the abyss is spoken of as, conjunctively with the ten kings his adherents, hating and desolating and consuming with fire the old seven-hilled imperial and Papal capital of Rome;¹ in Apoc. xi. 7 as in that same seven-hilled Rome, just as if still his capital, (for so I, as well as the author of the *Horæ Apoc.* explain “the *great city*” there specified,)² conjunctively with the kings of the earth his adherents, murdering Christ's two sackcloth-robed witnesses, and rejoicing over their dead bodies!—Yet once more, 4thly, as regards his *time of duration*, after stating in my Comment on 2 Thess. ii. that Christ's coming and destruction of him is “*immediately*” (say, very speedily) to follow his manifestation, a view repeated substantially in my Apocalyptic Commentary,³ I, notwithstanding, most distinctly, and as a fundamental point of my exposition, identify him with Daniel's little horn; and make his duration consequently

last phase being, though *professedly* Christian, yet in reality *heathen*, like all the other previous seven heads. Compare too 1 Cor. xii. 15; ‘Ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι χεῖρ οὐκ εἰμι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος; “Am I not of the body?” Or, “do I not appertain to the body?” as Winer to the same effect translates it.

On the expression in 1 Joh. ii. 19 I see that *you* too substantially explain it as I have done:—“The sense is, if they had *really belonged to our number*, had been true servants of Christ, they would have endured.” At the same time you add; “ἐκ with εἶναι is very frequently used by our Apostle to denote that *inner and vital dependence* which betokens origin:” referring to Joh. iii. 31; vii. 17; viii. 23, 44, &c. Very different *this* from the meaning that your Commentary here attaches to the phrase.

¹ You here take (as might be expected) the usual reading of the best Greek MSS., *καὶ*; not *ἐν*; which however I prefer to take myself.

² Including however the Papal *civitas*, as well as the Papal seven-hilled capital; just as I do both on Apoc. xi. 8 and 13.

³ See Note ¹ to p. 45; also the citation from your Comments both on 2 Thess. ii. and Apoc. xvii. 11, in the Note at pp. 39, 40.

(as was seen before) to be more, rather than less, than 1260 years: though still half oscillating between the assignment of that prophetic term of duration to the 7th or the 8th,—the *Papal* or yet future *post-Papal*,—headship (according to my theory) of the Apocalyptic Beast.¹

“Alas! on reviewing the whole, I must confess (though I have put a good face on the thing in my Commentary, I am hopelessly lost in perplexity! Well would it have been had I never committed myself as I did in my Prolegomena to 2 Thess. ii. on the Man of Sin! Well had I not permitted myself (like so many others who affect to be thought scholars now-a-days) to be taken in by *German* explanations, such as of the Beast, as if a mark of advanced scholarship, and more to be depended on than our old-fashioned Anglo-Saxon common-sense Apocalyptic expositors! Then, together with the latter, I might quite consistently have explained the Dragon with his seven heads in Apoc. xii. as meant of the Roman heathen government in its seventh phase, headship, and æra;—the Dragon’s fall (fulfilled in the fall of Roman heathendom under Constantine) as the fall of that 7th head, and commencement of the Roman Beast’s “is not” æra;—a non-existence in the bestial spirit and character consequent on that deadly wound received by it:—the resuscitated Beast, with its deadly wound healed, (alike that of Apoc. xiii. and xvii., which now I am so inconsistent in identifying,) as realized in Rome’s revived dominancy, under the Papacy: the Popes of Rome, in the character of Christ’s Vicars, being its new 7th, or successional 8th head; itself to last 1260 years in supremacy of power; and, in its seven-hilled capital, to be the slayer of Christ’s two sackcloth-robed witnesses.—Then too I should have been able to rest with abiding satis-

¹ See Note ² p. 39, and Note * p. 41. The term must be that of the *Papal* headship, if corresponding with that of the Woman’s exile in the Wilderness.

faction on the word *Λατεινος* suggested by Irenæus, and so many Anglo-Saxon expositors after him, (aye and even by German expositors too,) as the name and number of the Beast; and not had to print my strong retraction in the Prolegomena of that solution of which I had as strongly expressed my approbation before in my Commentary.¹ For wherefore the retraction? Is it not because (though I have not expressed the reason in my Prolegomena) I saw that it would only answer to the Beast as *distinctively Roman*, distinctively associated through every stage of his existence with the Roman seven-hilled capital: and not as well to the Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, and Greek empires also; accordantly with the necessities of my German *generic* interpretation of the Beast, as the *World-power* in all its phases?"

* * * * *

And so here, Mr. Dean, I finish my somewhat full exposé of your Commentary on the Apocalyptic Beast; praying you to forgive the freedom with which I have made it, as being

¹ On Apoc. xvii. 18, "Here is wisdom; let him that hath understanding calculate the number of the Beast, for the number of it is the number of a man, and the number is 666," you thus at p. 679 of your Commentary express yourself: "The number of a man means, counted as men generally count. As to it, of all the hundreds of attempts which have been made in answer to the Angel's challenge, there is but one which seems to approach near enough to an adequate solution to require serious consideration: viz., the word mentioned, though not adopted, by Irenæus, *Λατεινος*." Then, after stating (as is shown at large in the *Horæ Apoc.*) that the spelling of the word with the diphthong *ει* is perfectly legitimate, and descanting a little, after More and other previous Apocalyptic expositors, on the peculiar suitableness of the word to Papal Rome, you conclude thus: "Short of saying absolutely that this *was* the word in St. John's mind, I have the strongest persuasion that no other can be found approaching so near to a complete solution."

On the other hand, in the Prolegom., p. 252, you say: "Even while I print my note in favour of the *Λατεινος* of Irenæus, I feel almost disposed to withdraw it. Though the best solution which has been given, that it is not *the* solution I have a persuasion amounting to certainty."

(most sincerely may I say this) in the interests of *Truth*. And here too I end my general critical examination of your Apocalyptic Commentary. For I think that even you yourself will be inclined to admit that I have proved what I proposed to prove respecting it; and to think it needless, and consequently unfriendly severity, were I to prolong these hostile criticisms;—criticisms which you have, however, really absolutely called down on yourself and on your Book.

I had thought it might be well, ere concluding, to suggest the marked omission on your part of all use of certain indications furnished by the Divine giver of the Revelation,—alike in the form of the seven-sealed Apocalyptic scroll, in the Apocalyptic scenery, and in St. John the seer's own representative character,—of great help and value towards the right and full understanding of the prophecy; and from the omission of which your understanding of the prophecy has evidently much suffered. But I may perhaps quite as well allude to these in my next Letter, when I enter on the Second Part of my Pamphlet; and examination there, and I doubt not refutation, of your adverse criticisms on *my* Apocalyptic Exposition. For of course this is my primary object in what I am now writing. Very unsatisfactory to an inquirer after Divine truth would be my overthrow of your Apocalyptic Exposition, were I not to show that there is a counterview of the sacred prophecy very different, and with evidence of truth supporting it, that cannot be overthrown. To this, then, I shall propose to address myself in my next Letters. And, meanwhile,

I remain, dear Mr. Dean,

Faithfully yours,

E. B. E.

PART II.

EXAMINATION AND REFUTATION OF DEAN ALFORD'S CONDEMNATORY CRITICISMS ON THE EXPOSITIONS

IN THE

“HORÆ APOCALYPTICÆ.”

LETTER I.

ON MY EXPOSITION OF THE SEALS AND TRUMPETS.

DEAR MR. DEAN,

I TURN now to my own Apocalyptic Expositions, and your adverse criticisms, expressed or implied, on much the larger part of it. And forgive me if I confess to breathing more freely as I do so; and to having certain lines of our great poet running in my mind, after emergence from my toilsome wanderings through the darkness and perplexities of the chaotic Exposition which it was the duty forced upon me thus far to traverse,—

“At length the sacred influence
Of light appears.”

That such is the character of the Exposition which we have now to consider I shall not propound as my mere dictum, which would, of course, be worthless; but shall support it, point after point, by the evidence of matter of fact: calling on you, if you are able, to disprove this; but with the thorough conviction that it is what neither you, nor any

other man, ever can disprove. I have to acknowledge the courtesy and respect with which you have here and there alluded to my book, as well as to myself personally; more especially as admitting, not only its research, but also the accuracy and fairness with which I have sketched the views of other expositors, even though differing from my own.¹ I regret that I cannot here reciprocate the commendation. While obligingly speaking of me as a friend, from whom you differ only because compelled to it by regard to a friend more valued, viz., Truth,² you have in your condemnation of my interpretation almost uniformly avoided stating the evidence on which it is grounded, though often, as will soon be seen, most striking evidence:—a *suppressio veri* this, which seems ill to suit the character of one to whom truth is dearer than ought else; but which I would gladly refer to some pressure of hurried writing, or unconscious concentration of mind on the comparatively petty points of minute manuscriptal variations of reading, which evidently have much occupied you, and small grammatical niceties. My evidence is that of the *coincidences of the prophecy*, as I expound it, and *historic fact*:—coincidences continuous from the time of St. John down even to the present time; and such as to exhibit, as embraced within the Apocalyptic prophecy, a prefiguration that may well be called philosophical of all the most characteristic and important phases and events, together with their secret springs and remoter

¹ So at p. 247 of the Prolegomena to your Commentary; and also, let me add, in a private Letter to myself; in which you speak of having sufficiently often tracked my statements, especially in my “History of Apocalyptic Interpretation,” to the original authorities, and found them accurate, to satisfy you on that head.

² This is at p. 644, in allusion to my explanation of the 6th Trumpet, of which more hereafter. “I cannot but here mention,” you say, “in no unfriendly spirit, but because, both being friends, Truth is the dearer, that which may be designated as the culminating instance of incongruous interpretation in Mr. E.’s historical exposition of these prophecies.”

results, in the then coming future of the world and of the Church:—coincidences, not such as might suggest themselves from the mere turning about of the prophetic symbols in the kaleidoscope of an ingenious fancy, of which I am well aware there has been given exemplification too frequent and abundant by many other Apocalyptic expositors, alike ancient and modern; (against this the very nature and instinct of my own mind is repugnant;) but coincidences distinct, peculiar, striking, and inapplicable in similar strength and distinctness to ought else in history:—coincidences, moreover, of evidence of very various character, sometimes in curious combination; and altogether resulting in a view of the world's and Church's coming history, such as to make up a grand consistent whole. Do I overstate in so speaking? It will be for you, I again say, to prove it, if I do. We stand, as it were, in a court of equity before the literary public. Let yours be the part, if you prefer it, (though I hope your choice will be better and fairer,) of opposing counsel. For myself, I wish not to speak as an advocate on my own side; but rather in that spirit which has always been the object of my admiration, and the object, too, I may truly say, of my imitation, when called to the investigation of important truth;—the spirit, ever bent on fairly weighing *all* propounded evidence, of an English judge. Most thankful am I to have before the world the counter-views of a man who has attained to the position you have, alike as a commentator of some repute on Scripture, and from your consequent elevation to ecclesiastical eminence. For the repute of their author must needs command attention for his expository views on the Apocalypse, as well as on other Scripture. And nothing, I think, can more effectually serve to throw out into striking relief the strength of evidence and consistency of my views, than the want of evidence and inconsistency which characterize

yours. Why is it that I am thankful for this? Most certainly not from any personal consideration; but because I am persuaded that the cause I have in hand is that of *Truth, Divine Truth*:—a cause that has unconsciously been betrayed in our own days, even by friends, (of whom you, I know, are heartily one), into the hands of infidelity; whether through want of judgment, of due literary preparation of mind, or of time for full and calm consideration of the subject expounded, in their comments on the Book of God.

So proceed we to our investigations. The subject of my present Letter will be my exposition of the *Seals* and *six first Trumpets*, with the grounds of evidence that support it, and of your adverse judgment and counter-opinion rejecting it: the subject of my next that of the Apocalyptic prophecy of the *Beast*, with its adjuncts, including the previous but closely-connected symbolizations of the *two sackcloth-robed Witnesses*, and *seven-headed Dragon*; considered still in the same double point of view.

I. First, then, as to the Exposition of the SEALS in the “*Horæ Apocalypticæ*.”

And here, to begin, I of course take that natural view which supposes the connexion of identity of subject between the visions successively exhibited before St. John, and the writing, or picturing,¹ on the parts of the seven-sealed scroll successively opened, introductorily to those visions, by the breaking of the Seals. So natural is this view, that the counter-view, which you are at such pains to impress

¹ Old MS. scrolls I have seen, both in the Vatican and the British Museum Libraries, which are divided by perpendicular lines into pages, as it were; and with the subjects of each there represented both in writing and pictorially.

on your readers, appears to me, not only strange, but inexplicable: it being to the effect that, as the Seals were successively broken by the Lamb, nothing was opened or revealed of the contents of the scroll; but only preparation gradually made thereby for their disclosure at the breaking of the 7th Seal, or beginning of the saints' eternal rest; then when a revelation of the whole providential scheme of God respecting His Church while in this world, is, we know, to be made to saints and angels.¹ But two or three

¹ Not less than five or six times is this view inculcated in your book. So first in the Prolegom., pp. 254, 255 :—"The Lamb opens one after another the seals of the closed book, or roll; so that when they are all opened it may be unrolled and read. One point I have urged in my Notes (to the Commentary); viz., that it is never during the prophecy actually opened, nor is any part of it read. The openings of its successive seals are but the successive *preparations* for its contents to be disclosed; and, as each is opened, a new class of preparations is seen in prophetic vision. When the seventh is loosed, and all is ready for the unfolding and reading, [what then?—the reading of its contents? No; but] there is a symbolic silence, and a new series of visions begins."

So again on the first mention of the seven-sealed roll, or book, Apoc. v. 1; Comment., p. 602: "That the roll in the vision was unfolded is nowhere to be gathered from the text. . . . These (the Seal) visions are merely symbolic representations of the progress of God's manifestation of the purpose of His will. Not its contents, but the gradual steps of access to it, are represented by these visions. What is in that book shall not be known until those material events which marked the gradual opening of the sum of God's purposes are all past; and the roll is contemplated in its completeness (so Eph. iii. 10) by the spirits of the glorified hereafter." Yet presently afterwards, p. 603, you say, "The opening of the Seals, as notified by the *symbolic visions belonging to each* (p. 628, '*appropriate to each*') does not relate to things past, but things future." How so, if with nothing correspondent written within on a page of the scroll thus opened? Do you suppose the Lamb's cracking of the Seals to have been a mere audible signal for the exhibition of some certain visions, like the Trumpet Angels' soundings afterwards?

So yet again, p. 610, on Apoc. vi. 1, where you declare it to be "*of the first importance* to bear this in mind;" also p. 624, on the palm-bearing vision in Apoc. vii., where you say that "before the 7th and last Seal can be opened, and the book of God's purposes be unrolled, the whole multitude of the redeemed must be gathered in, and that then we shall know as we are known."

questions here suggest themselves, each alike putting its negative on this strange notion ; one, which I shall notice first, extra-Apocalyptic, the others directly Apocalyptic. 1st, then, can we believe that the actual events, as they occur, of the world's and Church's history, and the gradual unfoldings of God's providential purposes in them, are hidden from the knowledge of angels and saints, even till Christ's second coming? How can Dean Alford imagine, much more how can he write down in his book, an idea so absurd, unscriptural, and contrary to the obvious facts? 2dly, if the seven primary Apocalyptic visions, represented successively before St. John when the Seals were successively broken, had nothing in what was thereby unfolded in the Scroll corresponding with them, why was their representation connected in each case with the seven Seals' respective openings ; indeed so connected as to imply that but for those openings, and as in connexion with what the Lamb thus unfolded in the Scroll, no such visions depictive of the future would have been given? And why, again, 3dly, on your hypothesis, when the 7th Seal was at last broken, was there a hiding, instead of disclosure, of the Scroll's written contents from the gathered auditory on the Apocalyptic scene? ¹ Moreover, 4thly, wherefore the distinction that the latter half of the 6th Trumpet, and all subsequent to it in the

¹ Very curious is your attempt at accounting for this. When the 7th Seal is opened, and so (to use your own words, p. 628) "the only yet remaining obstacle removed to the entire disclosure of the secret purposes of God," you explain that the half-hour's silence spoken of as then occurring in heaven, (*ibid.*) imported two things : 1st, (in accordance with Victorinus's comment,) the beginning of the saints' everlasting rest ; 2dly, "*the passing over and withholding, so far as the Apostle is concerned, of that which the 7th Seal revealed ; i.e., the book of God's eternal purposes, and times and seasons which He holds in His own power.*"

I must beg my general readers to refer, if they have the opportunity, to the passages themselves whence I have cited from your Commentary : in order to assure themselves that I have here in no wise misrepresented you ; which otherwise some, perhaps, might well be apt to think.

Apocalyptic Book, as we have it, should have its place in a written Book given open in the vision of Apoc. x. into the hands of St. John; while all the previous figurations, including both those of the seven Seals, and those of the five first Trumpets, and first half of the 6th, had no place in any such written prophetic document: and indeed, by its thus being given him, all that was afterwards exhibited in vision forestalled, and its elaborate exhibition made a mere work of supererogation?¹

And now, then, proceeding to the *Seal Visions*, as explained in the *Horæ Apocalypticæ*, I must pray you to mark the contrast of the mode of procedure followed out, in order to the discovery of the intended meaning of the visions, in your case and in my own. It is your plan carefully to shun dealing with their particularities individually: and, under the misty covert of some general idea, to suggest a solution on which, instead of those individual particularities each one telling to the effect required, either an apology will have to be offered (or something very like it) for much that must appear on such an expository hypothesis unsuitable or needless encumbrances in the Apocalyptic symbolization, of which a striking exemplification will be found in your 3d Seal;² or else, as for example in your 4th Seal, the fact of those encumbrances, however obvious, past over unnoticed in perfect silence.³ On the

¹ See the Comment., at pp. 651, 652, on the little opened book given in Apoc. x. to St. John: where, after repeating that the seven-sealed book is "the sum of the Divine purposes, which *is not opened at all within the limits of the Apocalyptic vision*," you say that the little opened book is "no portion of it," but contains within it what the Angel calls the mystery of God, or "remainder of the Apocalyptic prophecies;" *i.e.*, all from the beginning of Apoc. x., or the middle of the 7th Trumpet: the latter half of that Trumpet having thus place in a written book, the former half not! I have already directed attention to this in the *Alfordian Apocalyptic Schedule*, p. 21, and Note referring to it, p. 20.

² See Note ³, p. 26.

³ See my notice on this point, p. 28, *suprà*.

contrary, it has been my own plan to deal with the symbolizations as having that perfectness in parts, as well as in the resulting whole, which *à priori* might be expected to characterize God's prophetic word, even as His works.¹

1. *E.g.*, in the Apocalyptic symbolization (one of tenfold importance in Apocalyptic exposition, because primary,) of the *first* Seal, six particulars there are to be noted, or rather *seven*:—the symbol of the *horse*; a symbol repeated, and of course in a similar sense, in the three Seal visions next following:—that of the *rider* mounted on, and guiding it; with the characteristic primarily of bearing a *bow* in hand, then that of having a *στέφανος*, or *crown*, given him: the twofold effect resulting, 1st, of his *going forth conquering and to conquer* (to the end evidently of the time included in the Seal); 2dly, of his causing by his rule and guidance, to that which the horse symbolized, a state corresponding with what was indicated by its *white colour*:—and all this as at an *epoch of commencement* close following, according to the revealing Angel's declaration, on the last year of the Emperor Domitian's reign; *i.e.*, A.D. 96, when the Apocalyptic visions (as we agree)² were given to St. John in Patmos.—Now, as I inquired into each of these particular symbols, and explanatory statements accompanying, what found I? I found the *horse* to have been stamped on the early coins of the *Roman people* (a type renewed on the Roman coinage ere St. John's death), as an animal sacred to their reputed father Mars; besides that horse-races were solemnly celebrated each year at Rome for the same reason, on the day sacred to Mars in the Roman calendar: whence (over and above its fitness as the *bellator equus*) was not the propriety obvious of the *horse* being figured as a symbol of the Roman people; just as the *goat*,—an

¹ So Eccles. iii. 14; speaking of God's work as perfect: "nothing can be added to it, nor anything taken from it."

² See p. 2, *suprà*.

emblem sometimes stamped on Macedonian coins, as connected with that nation's fabled original,—was selected in Daniel's prophecy as a symbol of the Macedonians?—Then, as to the *rider*, the badge of the *bow* in hand was a badge of *Cretan* connexion, according to express documental testimony extant in St. John's time, as well as to the world-repute for ages of the Cretan archery; and the badge of the *στέφανος*, or imperial *laurel crown* given him, a sign of his *appointment to the Emperorship*: while the horse's *white colour*, and the divinely-added explanatory statement, indicated the conjunction (a conjunction not always found) of general prosperity and happiness with the triumphant career of the Roman people, under his *regime*; and this from first to last.—Of all which not one single point was there which I have not shown to have had fulfilment in the ever-memorable era, associated with the names of Trajan and the Antonines, that supervened on the death of the infamous emperor Domitian, just about a year or so after the revelation to St. John in Patmos.¹ On Domitian's assassination, it has been shown, an aged General, Nerva, noted at the time as of foreign *Cretan* extraction, was chosen out, contrary to all former rule and precedent, and presented by the Senate with the imperial *στέφανος*, or *laurel crown*: a *Cretico-imperial line* then began by Nerva's adoption of Trajan as his son and successor; which was perpetuated by Trajan's adoption of Hadrian, Hadrian's of the elder Antonine, the elder Antonine's of the younger Antonine Marcus Aurelius, with whose actual son, Commodus, the Cretico-imperial line ended:—an æra of some 80 or 90 years thereupon commencing which was famed, even

¹ I must of course beg to refer general readers to the ample (perhaps some may think more than ample) evidence, on every point here asserted, which I have given in my chapter on the subject in the *Horæ Apocalypticæ*:—in the 5th Edition, just published, some little more fully even than before.

at the time, as the *golden æra* of imperial Rome; and of which the general character given by Gibbon, and other modern philosophic historians, is that it was an æra to the Roman people of happiness and prosperity altogether unparalleled in the world's history: an æra, too, which was illustrated by the far-famed triumphs of Trajan near its commencement, and harder won but yet more wondrous triumphs of M. Aurelius near its close; as it was said, "He went forth conquering," at the beginning of this Seal's æra, and with a destiny attached that "conquer he should," even to the end.—As if to make the evidence of coincidence more striking between the prophecy and the history on this most critical and important, because primary, prefiguration in the Apocalyptic prophecy, it has been providentially ordered that not only should there be written historical testimony to the truth of each particular noted, but evidence to the eye, as I have exemplified in my Book, in medals and other ancient monuments still extant:—about the *horse*, as in the minds of Romans, an animal sacred to their chief god and supposed father Mars, in the medals already alluded to: about the *bow*, as a Cretan emblem, in Cretan medals; and with allusion to it, and his own Cretic original, in some too of Nerva's own coins, as well-skilled numismatists have judged: about the *crown-giving*, as the then badge of Roman imperial sovereignty, in numerous coins of the Cretico-imperial as well as of other times; and, moreover, about the "*going forth*" of an emperor to war and victory, or "*profectio Augusti*," (the precise Apocalyptic expression,) in other coins, such as of Trajan and M. Aurelius specifically, which I have had engraved in the new edition of my *Horæ*: finally, of the earlier *triumphs of Trajan*, and later of *M. Aurelius Antoninus*, alike in Roman coins, and in the magnificent columns of Trajan and Antonine still existing at Rome.

2. Sharp and clear was the line of demarcation in the prophetic picturings (as I understand them) between that *first* figured æra in the coming fortunes of the Roman world, and the *second*:—the horse now *red*, as with the colour of blood-shed; the cause, as explained, not that of the carnage of war *from without*, such as through barbarian inroads across the frontier, but that of the carnage of *civil war*, as it was said, "that peace should be taken from the earth" (the *Roman* earth, evidently),¹ and that *they* (the inhabitants of that Roman earth) *should kill one another*; the presiding and causal influence that indicated by a rider to whom a great sword (*μαχαίρα*)² was given:—the badge this (I refer to the presentation of the sword) that of the military profession generally; and, when presented imperially and in state, of the chief Roman military generals, such as the Prætorian Prefects in Italy, and military Lieutenants of the great armies on the frontiers. Thus there are *four* or *five* points here for historic verification:—the *blood-dyed character* of the new æra; its *succession* chronologically, as next after the before-depicted æra of triumph and prosperity; the wars of the blood-shedding *civil wars*; the parties causing it *military men*, especially the great military commanders; and this through their investiture professionally with *undue authority*, such as the great *μαχαίρα* presented to the rider in the vision implied.—And did the next page, then, in Roman history answer to all this? You know how I have shown that it did:—an æra being recorded there, commencing from the 4th or 5th year of the reign of Com-

¹ See the Note 2, p. 25, *suprà*.

² The English rendering in our Authorized Version does not express the peculiarity of the original. It is to be understood that the word *μαχαίρα* in the original Greek means, properly, a dagger, or *short* kind of sword; *ξίφος* being the word more usually employed to signify one of larger size, as well as other form. But here, though a *μαχαίρα* in shape, it was a *μαχαίρα* of a size unnaturally, or rather strangely and unsuitably, large.

modus; when the undue authority of all but supreme civil, as well as military, power having been attached by Commodus to the Prætorian Prefects, their ambition, and that of the army at Rome which they commanded, soon made itself felt in revolutionary action, and civil war, and carnage:—an example quickly imitated by the great armies on the frontier, and their commanders; whence a spreading of the revolutions and bloodshed of civil war over the Roman world, and this with but two intermissions for near a hundred years. “The *power of the sword*” is the well-known commencement of Gibbon’s introductory Chapter on the subject of its supremacy in the Empire, as then begun: and well known too is his statement that “the licentious fury of the Prætorian Guards was the first symptom, and cause, of the decline of the Roman Empire.” And what the measure of the evil consequent? “In the ninety-two years from 192 to 284,” says Sismondi, “thirty-two Emperors, and twenty-seven pretenders to the empire, alternately hurled each other from the throne by nearly incessant civil warfare: teaching the world on what a frail foundation the virtue of (Trajan and) the Antonines had reared the felicity of the Empire.”—Is there here wanting any one point of coincidence between the prophetic figuration and the chapter thus portrayed of Roman history?

3. But not unattended by other evils could be this evil of military misrule, with its revolutionary violence and bloody civil wars. Whence the funds by which to pacify, or control, the thus exaggerated power of the sword, and so to make government possible? As the destructive rocky fragment rolled down a precipice sets in movement other rocky fragments, and causes them to join it in its desolating progress, so in the case of the evil of military misrule and domination just described. Must it not be followed up by that of the aggravated *pressure of taxation*? It is this

that Gibbon dwells on as the next concurrent cause of the Roman Empire's decline : and such, I doubt not, was the evil pictured in the Apocalyptic 3d Seal. For what the figuration?—the horse *black*, that well-known colour of distress and mourning ; the rider *one with balance in hand* ; a voice from the throne (that seat of divine equity) implying that he had to do officially with *corn, wine, and oil* ; and enjoining on him *justice*, and a certain *price* too of the corn, which, from its connexion with the former charge by the conjunctive "*and*," must evidently have meant a fair price : the ineffectiveness however of the charge appearing from the fact of the horse's black and mourning colour being still continued throughout the period of this Seal, under the balance-bearing rider's influence. Now have I not, in the medals engraved in the "*Horæ*," given proof striking to the very eye that Roman provincial governors were here symbolized, to whom the tax-collection was officially intrusted by the Emperors alike of money and of produce ; specifically of that of corn, wine, and oil ? Have I not shown the memorable epoch of the aggravation of this taxation to have begun with Caracalla's famous edict, about A.D. 220, making all the provincials of the empire Roman citizens, with the onerous condition of their taxation as Roman citizens being added to that of Roman provincials ; and the general misery and oppression consequent ? Have I not shown, too, that laws of equity were enjoined on these governors, but in vain ; and, more especially, that the price of wheat specified in the voice from the throne, in the Apocalyptic vision, would seem from the statistics that remain to us to have been approximately near about the fair average price in the reign of Alexander Severus ; by which Emperor the last stand was made on the side of mercy and equity in the taxation of the Empire, but still in vain ? For, as Gibbon says, he did but aggravate the evil which he tried to cure, and paid with his own life for the attempt at reform : leaving the

evil still to gather strength, and “to darken the Roman world with its deadly shade.” Is there here any coincidence then wanting between the prophecy and the history? Surely not one. And mark how many the coincidences!—the *era* as following on that of the former Seal:—the *colour* that of distress and mourning:—the *rider*, as marked both by the badge of the balance-bearing and the charge from the throne to equity; in which charge, moreover, the four chief *articles of produce* falling under the Roman law of taxation are specified, *wheat, barley, wine, oil*:—also, finally, a price of wheat specified, which appears to have been approximately (as before observed) its average price in the Roman Empire about the time of Alexander Severus. To all which there is to be added the singular monumental illustration still remaining to us of an imperial 2lb. market weight, stamped with the date of Alexander Severus’s reign, and answering precisely to the *chaenix* measure of wheat specified in the voice from the throne in the Apocalyptic vision:—a selected *small* measure, I imagine, to show how the oppression of taxation was then to fall even on the smallest proprietor, the universal population; so as, in fact, it did. Fully six coincidences have we here between the prophecy and the history.—And what have you to say to controvert them? Nothing whatsoever but a vain dictum against construing the *τον οινον και τον ελαιον μη αδικησης*, as, *Act not unjustly in regard to the wine and oil*:—a dictum vain, because unwarrantably robbing the *αδικεω*, with an accusative in the same clause, of the right of construction universally attaching in Greek to neutral verbs.¹

¹ I have illustrated in my book by the brief example from Anacreon;

τριχας γερων μεν εστι,
τας δε φρενας νεαζει.

“Not,” you say, “as Heinrichs and Elliott, Do not thou commit injustice in the matter of the oil and the wine. *Αδικειν*, with the accusative of the material object hurt or injured, is the constant habit [five times in all] of

As to the 4th Seal, the coincidence on every single point between the characteristics of the æra *Apocalyptically prefigured* in it, and the characteristics of the next following memorable *historic* æra after that of Caracalla and Alexander Severus, I mean that associated with the name of Gallienus, is such and so notorious that it seems almost needless to illustrate it. Said the prefigurative prophecy; "When he had opened the 4th Seal, behold a horse *livid* (as with *deathlike pallor*): and to him that sate thereon was the name *Death*, and *Hades* followed after him: and to him was given power to kill on the fourth part (or four parts) of the earth, with the *sword*, and with *famine*, and with *pestilence*, and with *the wild beasts* of the earth." Says the historian in his retrospective sketch:—"From the celebration of the secular games, A.D. 248, by the Emperor Philip to the death of Gallienus, A.D. 268, were 20 years to the empire of shame and misfortune, of confusion and calamity." He depicts the three chief agencies of destruction as consuming it;—"the sword, famine, pestilence:" ("a pestilence which from A.D. 250 to A.D. 265 raged without interruption in every province, every city, and almost every family in the empire:") to which Arnobius, a contemporary writer, adds that of *wild beasts*. As to the extent of mortality resulting, Gibbon says; "Could we venture to extend the analogy of Alexandria to the other provinces, we might suspect that war famine and pestilence had consumed in a few years the moiety of the human species:" and he adds that "the ruined empire seemed to approach the last and fatal moment of its *dissolution*." So too Schlegel, Sis-

our writer; and in no case do we find the other construction used by him; or indeed by any other writer, to my knowledge; except with such general adverbial accusatives as *τι* and *ουθεν*." To prove your point you should have not confined yourself to the case of *ἀδικεῖν* as a *transitive* verb; but have shown, that, in its character as an *intransitive* or *neutral* verb, it should be cut off from the universal right of neutral verbs in construction with accusatives.

mondi, Niebuhr. Says the last mentioned writer; "The condition of the empire after the cessation of the great plague, was like that which followed the cessation of the BLACK DEATH in the middle age." Nor indeed could the destroyers be said to have relaxed in their work till after Diocletian's tranquillization of the empire in 284.—If we go more into particulars the correspondence will only appear yet the more striking.—And what your objections to the evidence of these coincidences? Precisely nothing, as to all the particulars specified above: but only, as regards the extent of territory affected, a hint that the *fourth part of the earth*, as the reading of all extant Greek MSS., ought to be received and recognised as marking the *Apocalyptic* limit of the evils specified; ¹ not Jerome's reading of *the four parts of the earth*, received by me, as according with the *historic* record of the times of Gallienus, which makes the evils to extend over the whole Roman world. But how such an intended limitation of them, consistently with the fact of the horse appearing all over invested with the colour of death; and while Death too, impersonated, is depicted as bestriding its whole body? What again the explanation by expositors of such a limit, on any different theory from my own of Apocalyptic interpretation? How you yourself break down here has already appeared.² Nor, I may say, is there a single expositor, ancient or modern, who has found himself able to offer a consistent explanation of it. Well then surely am I justified in taking Jerome's different reading, "over *the four parts* of the earth;"—a reading of his Latin Vulgate which I have myself verified in the earliest and best MS. of it existing, viz., that in the Laurentian Library at Florence. Which reading, if answering in MSS. extant in Jerome's time to the Greek $\tauὰ δ' τῆς γῆς$, instead of the received $τὸ δ'$, well answers to my solution. Or, if it answer to the Greek $τὸ τετραδιον$, instead of $τὸ τετρατον$, or $τὸ$

¹ Comment. p. 615, compared with 634.

² See p. 29, Note ¹, *supra*.

τεταρτον, (the literal smallness of difference is in either case obvious,) still more striking will be its correspondence with my solution. For, just at that epoch began a division of the Roman world *de facto* into *four parts*, which was made a *legal* division soon after by Diocletian, and constituted the territorial basis of his famous new quadripartite government of the Roman world:—a quadripartite division rendered still further remarkable by the absorption in Constantine's time, shortly after Diocletian, of two of the divisions into one; and so a *threefold* division introduced, answering, as I contend, to the *threefold Apocalyptic division* referred to both under the Trumpets and in the vision of the Dragon and Woman, Apoc. xii.

On the whole in these several Seal visions, as explained by me, it will be seen that there are not less than twenty coincidences (coincidences striking, peculiar, consistent) between the prophecy and the history. And how do you answer, or negative, the evidence from them? You simply pass it over *sub silentio*: and this in favour of a counter-solution for which there is not, as we have seen, one particle of evidence worth consideration; but evidence all to the contrary.

Still stronger, even yet, becomes the evidence for the solution I have offered when, advancing to the 5th Seal in the *prophecy*, we find an *æra* of *Christian martyrdoms* figured, as the crisis and consummation of persecutions and martyrdoms long previously suffered by Christians from the inhabitants of the Roman world: and, in the *history*, find Diocletian's reign designated among Christians of the times just succeeding as the *Æra of Martyrs*: the miseries of the sad times previous having in fact been popularly ascribed to the advance of Christianity, and consequent neglect of the old Roman heathen gods; whence the cry which ascended from the populace to the Emperor, "Christiani ad leones."—And stronger still becomes the

evidence from the additional fact of this æra of martyrs being succeeded in the next prophetic vision (that of the 6th Seal) by a symbolization which, construed like similar symbolizations in the Old Testament prophets, seemed to betoken a mighty revolution both political and religious in the Roman Empire: just such a revolution as the historic page next sets forth, as the Constantinian, or rather Constantino-Theodosian, overthrow of Heathenism in the Roman world.

And so we arrive at the amount of nearer thirty than twenty coincidences between the successive figurations in the Seal visions and the chief successive phases and fortunes of the Roman world and Christian Church, in the course of the two centuries following forthwith after the revelation made to St. John in Patmos:—a number yet more increased, if we add the very interesting and important visions of the sealing and the palm-bearing, in which St. John himself had not only to be a spectator but a participator, as the sequel of that great revolution which constituted the primary subject of the 6th Seal; and then compare them with the history and doctrine of Augustine. But this involves the important interpretative principle, ignored by you, of *St. John's representative character* on the Apocalyptic scene; a point which it may be better to enter on in the discussion of Apoc. x., xi. Having therefore thus arrived at the 7th Seal, and its half-hour's silence in heaven,—to which latter you have thought well, as before stated, to attach so curious and incongruous a double signification,¹ but of which the much more natural explanation is that it marks the break between that Seal's opening, and the seven Trumpet visions which constitute its development,—I would only, ere passing on, ask you, if unable to disprove these many and multiform coincidences, whether you are really prepared to ascribe them to *chance*?

¹ See p. 56, Note 1.

Proceed we now,

Idly, to the TRUMPET VISIONS, as explained by me in the "H. A.;" with the evidence there given in support of those explanations, and your condemnatory criticisms against them.

Preliminarily however I must not omit briefly alluding to our very different views as to the purport of the *incense vision*;—the vision introductory to that of the Trumpet-soundings in Apoc. viii. 2, 3.

1. Most striking and most instructive is the prefigurative indication implied in the incense vision, (if rightly explained by me,) as to certain definite symptoms of commencing antichristian apostacy unfolding themselves in Roman Christendom, very very soon after the empire's nominal conversion to the Christian faith: and just in natural sequel, let me add, to what seemed implied respecting it in the previous vision of the sealing.¹ For in the incense-offering scene there depicted, in that Apocalyptic Jewish-like temple, or tabernacle, which seems to have been ever standing in the foreground of vision,² it was most pointedly intimated that by "the saints" distinctively and alone, or sealed 144,000 out of all the tribes of the professing Israel of the Roman world, would the incense of prayer be then offered through the mediatorship and propitiatory merit of our only great Angel High-Priest, Christ Jesus. To draw that inference from the Apocalyptic figuration, and the divinely added explanatory comment, there was needed nothing more than the application to it of that

¹ As regards the Sealing vision you thus far agree with me, in explaining the tribes of Israel there spoken of as meant of the *Christian* professing Israel.

² On the resemblance of the Apocalyptic temple, or tabernacle, so often spoken of, to the old Jewish tabernacle, which you would controvert, I shall have to speak when discussing the temple-measuring, Apoc. xi. 1, in my next Letter.

principle of *allusive contrast* which critical investigators so justly and usefully apply, as I have illustrated in my Book,¹ in the elucidation of Church Creeds, Church Articles of faith, Scripture prophecies of the Old Testament, and many an old legal or historical document too of a bygone æra.—And hence a strong historic corroboration to the correctness of this interpretation of the vision:—viz., that in the records of precisely that æra of the close of the 4th century, to which, on the evidence, as I have shown, of some thirty continuous coincidences between prophecy and history, the Seals' series of prefigurations have brought us, the fact of the apostacy of the great mass of Roman professing Christians to a belief in saints' mediatorship, and their consequent practical desertion of the Lord Jesus Christ in his character of our propitiation and mediator, by substituting those saints and their merits in his place, as that by which their prayers would be best made acceptable before God, is among the facts most prominent on the historic page.²—Whence, as I judge, and with too evident reason for it, the casting of the burning embers of God's neglected typical altar on the Roman earth, and consequent issuing forth of the Trumpet-judgments. All is thus consistent, all consecutive; as well as all evidenced by the correspondence of striking historic fact.

And what then is Dean Alford's objection to this; what his counter-solution of the vision? It is grounded on a statement in the Apocryphal Book of Tobit, which speaks of *created angels* exercising this function of offering up the

¹ See my Vol. i., pp. 273, 274 (5th Ed.); or p. 256, Ed. 4.

² In my H. A. *ad loc.*, I have observed on Gibbon's striking illustration of this point: heading a Chapter, as he does, in reference to the date A. D. 395, 396, just after Theodosius's death, and just previous to the first great Gothic irruption, thus:—"Destruction of Paganism. Introduction of worship of saints and relics among the Christians."

prayers of saints before God:¹ there being here, you would have it, an inspired Apocalyptic endorsement of this statement; such however as is no where else to be found in inspired Scripture. For, somewhat I must say presumptuously, taking for granted against the concurrent judgments of various expositors of note what most certainly you have not proved, and I am sure never will prove, that *Christ* is no where else in the Apocalypse designated as an *angel*, you argue hence that we are therefore bound here to understand by the incense-offering angel in vision a *created angel*;² and that it was his office to "incense the saints' prayers," and make them acceptable before God.³ And

¹ "I am Raphael, one of the seven holy angels who offer the prayers of the saints and enter before the glory of the Holy One." Tobit xii. 15.

² "*Another angel*: not," you say, "to be identified with *Christ*, so as is done by Bede, Vitringa, Calov. and recently by Elliott: for thus confusion is introduced into the whole imagery of the vision." How so? "In Ch. vii. 2 we have *ἄλλος ἄγγελος*, *another angel*, [viz., the sealing angel] in the sense of a *created angel*: (see my *Note there*:) and is it probable that St. John would, after this, and I may add with his constant usage of *angel* throughout this Book for angel in its ordinary sense, designate our Lord here by this title?"

What then is the elaborate argument, in the Note referred to by him on Apoc. vii. 2 ("see my Note there"), upon which Dean Alford rests as proof of the correctness of his view of the incense-offering angel here as a created angel? Just this. "I *saw another angel*:—as before simply an angel: not, as has been fancied, our Lord, nor the Holy Spirit: cf. *τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν* ('till we have sealed the servants of our God') below:"—he being "the God," you add, "alike of the *speaker* and those addressed."—Had you forgotten, when thus writing, how the Lord Jesus, *when just about to ascend to heaven*, and as if to mark the relationship in which as man, and redeemed man's representative, he would ever afterwards stand to the Father, said, "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and *to my God and your God*"?—Says Hengstenberg justly on Apoc. vii.; "The sealing angel is *Christ*. The description *suits Him only*."

I have myself, *in loc.*, argued out the identity of the *sealing* angel with Christ, as also that of the *incense-bearing* angel, somewhat fully. But clearest of all against Dean A.'s general statement is Apoc. x. 3; where the rainbow-vested angel speaks of the Witnesses as "*my Witnesses*." On which I shall have to remark in my next Letter.

³ "The object," you say, p. 631, "was to *incense* the prayers of the saints:—i. e. as expressed by Calov. *ut redderet eas boni odoris preces*."

what the nature and object of the prayers of all saints, thus made acceptable in heaven? To call down divine vengeance, you say, on the general inhabitants of the earth; such vengeance in fact, as, in consequence, followed under the Trumpets. How utterly contrary this to the spirit of Christian prayer respecting others, as enjoined in the Gospel, and as carried out by all sincere Christians, who knows better practically and experimentally than yourself, Mr. Dean? Do you in your prayers invoke God's curse on those that may hitherto have been enemies to the faith? Rather do you not yourself ever remember what our Lord has enjoined on his disciples, "Love your enemies, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you?" And, as our Lord, so too his apostles.¹ Thus is your general counter-explanation a libel (yourself being the judge) on Christ's faithful servants; as well as (what is much worse) a libel on Christ himself:—the latter, as if any but He could effectively act out the part of propitiation and mediator for sinful man;² any but He make sinful man's prayers acceptable before God. All this you set forth, we saw, as grounded simply and alone on a statement in *Apocryphal Scripture*; of which Apocryphal SS. the Church in which we both minister has solemnly and authoritatively declared in its 6th Article; "The Apocryphal books the Church doth read for example of life; but yet *doth not apply them to establish any doctrine.*" And you set it forth as a piece of information given on this occasion, all insulated and unconnected with any revelations

¹ So Rom. xii. 19–21; 1 Tim. ii. 2; 1 Pet. ii. 21, 23, &c. So too the blessed example of the proto-martyr Stephen; "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge."—There is no contradiction to this in the cry of the martyrs of the 5th Seal, explained so as in the "H. A."

² What a contrast the Evangelist St. John's own view! "If any man sin we have an *advocate* with the Father, *Jesus Christ the righteous*, who is the *propitiation* for our sins."

of the future, not to St. John only, but also to the heavenly company gathered round the throne of glorified saints and angels: who, by the way, must certainly have known the fact long before, if fact it really was; at any rate from after the time of Tobit.

2. Next as to the *four first Trumpet-judgments*;—including judgments on the third part of the (Roman) earth, third part of the sea, third part of the rivers, with the fountains of waters, and third part of the sun, moon, and stars in the firmament of the Apocalyptic visions.

The "*third part*" being here the point most prominent in the prophecy, it was my primary inquiry, when entering on the consideration of these visions, first, whether there was any such tripartition of the Roman empire about the time of that ever-memorable epoch of the close of the 4th century to which the previous prefigurative visions had, as I judged, so clearly brought us; next whether, if such were the case, there occurred desolations on one of those third parts of its land provinces, on its sea with the ultrà-marine provinces, on its great rivers, and on its ruling governmental luminaries or authorities, separately and consecutively, soon afterwards. To each of which two questions history returned me an answer clear and distinct in the affirmative. As to the 1st, it told how, after the bipartition of the Roman empire at the great Theodosius's death between his two sons, into the Eastern and the Western, the imperial appointment, or rather recognition, of Alarie as Master General of the vast Prefecture of Illyricum, and virtually, though not professedly, its independent ruler,¹ constituted that Prefecture one detached third of the old empire; and so the *Eastern* division on its one side, and the

¹ I have in my H. A. on this point cited the contemporary poet Claudian,

Vestator Achivæ
Gentis, et Epirum nuper populatus inultam,
Præsidet Illyrico.

Western on the other, each another third :—the former the same third which, some 80 years before, had formed the kingdom of Maximin, and then of Licinius, when making the last fight against Christianity (as figured in the Draconic vision of Apoc. xii.) on the side of Heathenism.¹ As to the 2d, it held forth emblazoned in lurid light upon its page the names, first, of *Alaric* and *Rhadagaisus*, then that of *Genseric*, then that of *Attila*, then that of *Odoacer*, as names ever famous for the desolation, first, of the land or European provinces of the Western third of the empire, then of its sea and maritime provinces and navy, then of its great rivers, vallies, and European fountains of waters ; ending finally in the extinction of the Emperorship itself, and subordinate imperial authorities of the Western empire.

Against which what has Dean Alford to allege? Do you, Mr. Dean, controvert any of these historic facts, as reported by me ; or their general coincidence with the Apocalyptic statements and symbols :—and, remember, neither are the prophetic figurations, nor the historic facts, of at all common character? Not so. You do not even notice them. You only thus dogmatically issue forth your condemnatory sentence against my explanation :—“ All *special* interpretations seem to me utterly to have failed ; and of these none so signally as that of Mr. Elliott, who would understand it of a tripartite division of the Roman empire at the time to which he assigns this judgment :”²—the main ground of this its condemnation being the “*fatal*” (!) objection, that the hail was said to have been cast on the earth *generally*, the burning mountain into the sea *generally* ; while the limitation of “the third part” only applied to the *destruction* wrought by these destroying agencies on the land. Thus the land (“cultivated land,” you say,) ³ and sea.

¹ See on this in my next Letter.

² So Comm. p. 634.

³ So, *motu proprio*, you yourself here limit the territorial extent of the earth affected by the plague ; in odd contradiction to your objugation

Whence, and as fortified, you further intimate, by the similarly indefinite purport of "the third part" in Apoc. xii. 4,¹ your inference that "the third part" was in all these pre-figurations of the four first Trumpets used *indefinitely*, (just like "the fourth part," and "the tenth part," elsewhere,²) as indicating the *limited amount* of the injury: it being thus implied that "God, even in these sweeping judgments, spares more than he smites; *two thirds* in each case escaping, while *one third* only is smitten."³

against me on the self-same page for applying to the herbage burnt up the Apocalyptic limitation of "the third" of the earth on which the fire was cast:—"Of *the earth*"; you say: "*i. e.* plainly, the surface of the earth, and that of the *cultivated* soil, which admitted of such a devastation."

As regards *the sea* and the creatures and ships in it, of the second plague, you favour us with no further explanation than the general one, applicable to all the four Trumpet-plagues, (as I have before noted, p. 7,) of their being plagues on "the accessories of life." You however controvert my statement as to *the sea* being used by Latin writers of the maritime coasts and ultra-marine provinces of the empire: accordantly with Facciolati's explanation, "*Mare interdum est regio maritima, et insule maris;*" and as exemplified from Tacitus, Hist. i. 2, among other authorities, "*Plenum exsiliis mare.*" Is the translation then preferred by you of this passage from Tacitus, "The *ocean-brine* is full of exiles"!—Compare the similarly large intent of the word *sea* in Apoc. x. 2.

¹ "The Dragon's tail *draws* (*συνει*) the third part of the stars of heaven": where, you say, "the use of the *present tense* shows that a *general* power, rather than particular event is designated." Unfortunately for your argument the verb in the next connected clause is in the aorist; "the tail *cast* (*εβαλεν*) some of the stars to the ground": and, presently afterwards, notwithstanding the "general" abiding power over the stars thus ascribed by you to the Dragon, he is said to have been cast altogether out of the starry region!—The frequent rashness and inaccuracy of your statements and reasonings really amazes me. Because in Isa. 53 it is said of Christ in the present tense, "He *is led* as a lamb, &c.," is it only a *general* character of the Lamb, and not a *particular event*, that is signified?

² Let the reader mark this. In fact, on Dean Alford's explanatory principles, "*the fourth*," "*the fifth*," &c., would here do just as well to express the meaning of the sacred prophecy as "*the third*."—Are not your own words of caution against an indefinite mystical interpretation of prophetic periods, p. 670, here applicable against you; lest thereby, you say, "we leave unfixed what the Spirit of God apparently intended us to ascertain"?

³ I a little abbreviate your words.

Surely, not to say anything of the worthlessness of your counter-view, which speaks for itself, there is nothing forced, unnatural, or uncommon in the supposition on which my explanation of the little clause about the grass proceeds; viz. that a limitation of it to the specified limits of the earth on which it grew is implied. I do but follow common sense in so limiting it. Let me then, in fine, beg my general readers to weigh, as in a balance, the vanity of your so-called "fatal" objection against the gravity of the evidence by which my solution of these four first Trumpet visions is supported; and then judge whether the latter is that which a truth-loving expositor of the passage ought, when condemning the solution, to ignore.

3. So we come to the *5th Trumpet-vision*; and my application of it, after Mede, and the great majority of English Protestant expositors, as a prefiguration of the irruption into Roman Christendom of *Mahommedanism and the Mahommedan Saracens*.

Strongly impressed with a sense of the importance of a clear and indisputable confirmation of the truth of this explanation of the 5th Trumpet figuration, not merely as considered in itself, but in its bearing also on other of the Apocalyptic visions, especially that of the 6th Trumpet next following, I was at pains to try it (since I saw that the fulness and peculiarity of the symbolic description would admit of my so doing) by a testing fuller and more stringent than had been applied to it by any previous expositor. Accordingly it was, as you know, a point of preliminary investigation by me whether the same rule of good taste (if I might so say) is observable in the figurative allusions, symbols, or personifications in Holy Scripture, which is very generally to be observed and admired in the writings of human authors of repute: viz. the choice of figures suitable to, and characteristic of, the people, country,

or local scene designated as the subject of reference. And, having shown in a chapter of very copious illustrations that such was notably the case in the figurative picturings or allusions of Holy Scripture, where the local scene or people meant is specified, and consequently known, it seemed to me that in a prophecy couched in complex and peculiar symbols, like those of the prefiguration of the 5th Trumpet, the intent of which was an enigma to be deciphered, we might by a reflex process argue from the symbols to the people or country symbolized, and hence find help towards the more sure deciphering of the intended subject.—Applying this criterion to the 5th Trumpet's vision it appeared most strikingly that its symbols, whether with regard to what was bestial in them, or what was human, were all *Arabian*, or *Saracenic*, in character;—alike the locust, the scorpion, the horse, the faces as faces of men, the hair long as hair of women, and the crowns on the scorpion-locusts' heads as of gold. With no other country or people, I found, but Arabia and the Arabs, could a correspondency of character so complete be shown in the Apocalyptic symbols; and indeed that of some of the symbols the Arabs themselves, of the times of Mahomet and the Caliphs his successors, were wont to speak as national characteristics.—Then, connectedly with all these indications of the particular people meant in the prophecy, when it appeared further that the portentous irruption of the Saracens into Roman Christendom arose out of the irresistible impulse of the fanaticism of the false religion of Mahomet, which had just then risen up among them, like smoke from the pit of hell, now wide opened by the great Spirit of Evil, as if one grand likely means of recovery from his late fall from supremacy in the heathen Roman empire,¹—the time being early in the

¹ I am happy in here at length finding a point of agreement with you. In my new edition, vol. i., printed some time before the publication of your Apocalyptic Commentary, I had, on reconsideration of the subject, expressed

seventh century, shortly after that formation of the Romano-Gothic kingdoms in the West which resulted in fine from the Gothic invasions prefigured in the previous Trumpets,—that they declared their mission against the men of Roman Christendom to be against them as idolaters,¹—also, as to the consequence of their irruption, that, notwithstanding their mighty victories and conquests, the result was not to destroy the political life of the people of Roman Christendom, but only (just in accordance with the *limitation* assigned to the symbolic scorpion-locusts in the Apocalyptic figuration) to torment them, even as with the envenomed scorpion sting,—while, with regard to the fruit-trees and herbage of the countries conquered, the habit, and indeed prescribed law with them, in direct contrast with the practice of the Goths and Vandals, (just again as Apocalyptically figured,) was not to desolate, but to preserve,²—and, once more, as to the *duration* of the plague in its intensity, that from the first date of Mahomet's announcing his mission, and emergence of the smoke of his false religion, together with the scorpion-locust forms of his disciples, from out of the pit of the abyss to the pacific settlement of the Saracen Caliphs at

my conviction, after Mede and other English expositors, of *Satan* being the fallen star intended ; (not *Mahomet*;) and with a probable reference in the symbol to the fall figured afterwards in the later but explanatory vision of Apoc. xii. After notice of Isa. xiv. 12, "How art thou fallen from heaven, Lucifer," &c., and Luke x. 18, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven," passages also cited by me, you add : "This expression forms a connecting link to Apoc. xii. 9 ; where Satan is represented as cast out of heaven to the earth."

¹ Or saint-worshippers. "Those that have not the seal of God on their foreheads." Compare what has been said on Apoc. vii. 3, 4, viii. 3, 4, p. 69, *suprà*.

² Compare Apoc. viii. 7 said of the one with Apoc. ix. 4 said of the other. On the hypothesis of the correctness of the Gothic and Sarcenic reference of the one and other prophecy respectively, the marked contrast of these two predictions, and marked fulfilment in either case by Goths and Saracens historically, seems to me very observable.

Bagdad, far away from the Roman capital, was just 150 years, correspondently, on the year-day principle, to the Apocalyptic term assigned to the scorpion-locust ravages of 5 months, or 150 days,—it seemed to me that nothing further was wanted to complete the parallel; and that there could be no reasonable doubt, (with those at least who regard the Apocalypse as a divinely-inspired prophecy of the future,) as to the irruption of the Mahometan Saracens into the Roman Empire in the 7th century, being the subject here refigured.¹

Notwithstanding, not only do you set aside this solution, but you do so with something like contempt and indignation. In reference to it, and more especially I think to my own copious illustrations of the evidence supporting it, you exclaim, "There is an endless Babel of allegorical and historical interpretation of these locusts from the pit."² —Do you, then, deny the fact of the literal and allegorical being intermixt in Scripture prophecy? Not so. On the contrary, you elsewhere expressly assert and apply it.³ Again, do you dispute the interpretative principle enforced by me, that from the local or national appropriateness of symbols in Scripture prophecy we may rightly argue as to the locality or nation intended? You will not surely attempt this. Or, finally, do you dispute the justness of my application of the principle to the multifold correspondence that I assert between the Mahometan Saracens and the scorpion-locusts of the Apocalyptic figuration, both in regard of the literal and the allegorical interpretation of the symbols? In fact you scarce allude to all this. Save only excepting,—an exception rather hinted than insisted on,—against my

¹ On all the above I must of course refer my general readers to the full development and illustration of every point in my "*Horæ Apocalypticeæ*."

² Comment. p. 641.

³ So *ib.* p. 633:—"There is every allowance to be made for the indisputable intermixture in many places of literal and allegorical meanings." So, too, p. 643, &c.

understanding of *ανθρωπων* in verse 7 of the human *male sex* distinctively, and the *crowns like gold* as meant of the gold-embroidered turbans of the Arabs,¹ the whole strength of the case, as urged by you, against my Saracenic application of the symbols consists in the vituperative designation of such my application of them as a “Babel” of admixture of historical and allegorical interpretation: forgetting, apparently, that Babel means confusion; whereas, in my application of the symbols, all is shown to be consistent and harmonious in its *oneness of significance*, as of Arab applicability.—As to any counter-interpretation, with which to meet and match it, you confess that you have none definitely to offer: though just suggesting, in strange and direct contradiction both to holy Scripture and to yourself, that the plague, as one of bodily suffering from which God’s saints, *if on the scene*, could not be supposed to be wholly exempt, must be at a time when the present admixture of tares and wheat shall no longer exist;²

¹ 1. That *ανθρωπος* is used of the human *male sex* distinctively in all the ten examples from the New Testament or Septuagint, (Eccl. vii. 28 inclusive,) you do not deny: but say that in those passages the word has *necessarily* that restricted meaning, being in contrast with *γυνή*, *woman*; and ought only so to be taken where the restricted meaning is similarly necessary. Now, as observed by me in *loc.*, there is in the verse here a double contrast; alike with the *woman* in the symbol, (“hair as hair of women,”) and with its general *bestial* resemblances. And, to mark the *double* contrast, the word *ανθρωπος*, susceptible as it is of both the *generic* sense as humankind, and *specific* as the *male* of humankind, seems just the most proper word.

2. As regards the “crowns like gold,” (*στέφανοι ὅμοιοι χρυσοῦ*), you suggest that the phrase “will *hardly* bear” my application of it to the gold-embroidered Arab turban; and that you would rather explain it of “a crown-shaped fillet (on the scorpion-locusts’ heads) which resembled gold in its material.” Not much of difference between us so far. The actual use of the word *στέφανοι* for the turbans of the ancient Sabæan Arabs, in the passage cited by me from Ezek. xxiii. 42, you do not notice.—Let me add from Niebuhr, with reference to noble Arabs of modern time, following no doubt their ancestors in this, that the uppermost cap of those which make up their turban “is usually *richly embroidered with gold*.”

² The idea is so strange that it is right I should here give your own words. “The plague [*i.e.* as that which is to fall distinctively on the unbelieving

that is, as Christ tells us, *at* and *after* His coming;¹ not, as your Apocalyptic Scheme tells us, *before* it.² No doubt God's elect, as you say, p. 644, were scattered up and down in corrupt Roman Christendom during the Saracenic irruptions. And from *real* evil they had *individually* a charter of exemption; just like the sealed with God's mark at the time of Jerusalem's siege and destruction by the Babylonians, and Christ's disciples at the time of its siege by the Romans.³ But it was against the apostate saint-worshipping men of Roman Christendom *as a community* that the Saracen scourge was commissioned. And, as regarded non-idolatrous Christian *Churches*, or *communities*, such as of the Nestorians and Paulikians, the Saracens, instead of persecuting, were a refuge to them from their pseudo-Christian persecutors.⁴

unsealed inhabitants of the earth] either denotes something purely spiritual, some misery from which they are exempt who have peace with God, which can hardly be, consistently with verses 5 and 6; or else it takes place in a state totally different from this present one, in which the tares and wheat are mingled together."—As regards the state of things, let me say, during the Apocalyptic Trumpets, the mention of the offering of the prayers of saints in the introductory incense-vision tells that saints were then existing; and what is said at the 7th Trumpet-sounding that then only had the time come for the saints receiving their reward. Accordant with this is the implication in the word "murders," Apoc. ix. 21, that saints, the subjects of those murders, were existing under the 6th Trumpet; so as explained not by me only, but by you, p. 645. The wheat, you seem to think, after separation under the 5th Trumpet, had, at the sounding of the 6th, condescendingly and kindly intermixed itself again with the tares!!

¹ So Matt. xiii. 30, 41.

² See the place of the 5th and other Trumpets in Alfordian Apocalyptic Scheme, p. 20, *suprà*.

³ Ezek. ix. 5, 6; Luke xxi. 18.—On the *latter* passage, "Not a hair of your head shall perish," *you yourself* thus comment: "Not literally, but really true; not corporeally, but in that real and only life which the disciple of Christ possesses."—On the *former*, would you argue from the Lord's charge to the destroying angels, "Come not near any man upon whom is my mark," that the destruction portended must have had reference to a state of the world quite different from the present, and in which the wheat had been already separated from the tares?

⁴ See my "H. A.," vol. ii., pp. 247, 252. (4th Ed.)

In conclusion, I must beg you—1st, to refute, if you can, any of the many asserted coincidences between the scorpion-locusts of the Apocalyptic figuration and the Arabs, or Saracens, at the epoch of their irruption into Roman Christendom in the 7th century; 2dly, to show, if you are able, a similar correspondence between the symbols and any other nation, or events, in the world's history; 3dly, if unable to show this, then to retract your condemnatory criticisms as unjust. Your only alternative will be, as before, that of asserting that all these coincidences, peculiar and characteristic as you find yourself forced to admit them to be, are but the result of *chance*.¹

4. So now we come to the similarly complex figuration

¹ Ere passing from the 5th Trumpet I must notice an utterly false charge that you here make against me. At verse 6, "In those days men shall seek death, and not find it," you thus remark:—"On the command *not to kill the men*, &c., in verse 5, Elliott says, '*i.e., not to annihilate them as a political Christian body*:'" whence, you add, "the present verse must in consistency mean that the political Christian body will be so sorely beset by these Mahomedan locusts, that it will vehemently desire to be annihilated, and not find any way; for the *killing of men* should not be said of their annihilation as a *political body* in one verse, and their *desiring to die* in the next be said of their *individual* misery. Is it in consequence of foreseeing this difficulty that Mr. E. has, as in the case of many important details in other places, omitted all consideration of this verse?"

Now, 1st, Mr. E., instead of omitting all consideration of the said verse, has, p. 425, (4th Ed.) the following observations on it:—"In those days men shall seek death, and shall not find it, and shall desire to die, and death shall flee from them." A statement of which the meaning is made clear by the parallel one in Jer. viii. 3; where it is said of the Jews taken captive to Babylon, 'And death shall be chosen rather than life, by all the residue of them that remain of this evil family.' . . . It is a strong proverbial expression of wretchedness."—This, observe, was in reference to a time when the same Jeremiah represents the Jewish people as *politically* killed and dead. So Lament. passim; also Hos. xiii. 1, cited by me in the "H. A."

2. As to your *general* charge against me of omitting to notice passages that might seem to tell against my view, I am really amazed at the boldness of so singularly untrue an accusation. I have (I may say) *never* knowingly omitted the notice of a difficulty in the way of my exposition. The examples you give,—alike this, and those referred to p. 92 *infra*,—are really nothing less than gross falsifications of fact.

of the *lion-headed horses and horsemen from the Euphrates*, of the *6th Trumpet*, whose appointed destiny it was "to slay the third part of the men"—a figuration interpreted by myself, as by most English Protestant Expositors before me, of the irruption of the Turks from the Euphrates in the 11th century; and their destruction, in fine, of the *Constantinopolitan*, or *Eastern third*, of the old Roman Empire.

Now here it is, more I think than anywhere else, that you express yourself most strongly against the interpretation offered by me. "We have here," you say, in reference to one of the particulars of my Turkish application, "the culminating instance of incongruous interpretation in Mr. E.'s historical interpretation of these prophecies:—an interpretation so wild that, if it refutes not itself, it seems scarcely capable of refutation." So in your Commentary: and in your Prolegomena you have this selfsame interpretation by me of the 6th Trumpet, I think, specially in mind when thus writing; "The fault of *wresting the text*, to make it suit a preconceived scheme, is so glaring in our Expositors of the historical school as to have inspired me with *disgust*."¹ Rather strong language, Mr. Dean! Let us now then, as before, compare the prophetic figuration and its historic application, so as given in the "Horæ"; note down the number and appropriateness of the coincidences; consider whether there is any other chapter in the world's history to which this prophetic figuration can be made similarly, and in all its most varying particulars, to apply; and, if the result of our investigation be that it does apply to what I say it does, and can be applied with similar appropriateness to nothing else in history, then further consider whether the coincidences can be regarded as the result of *chance*; and, if not, whether the conjunc-

¹ Comment. p. 644; Prolegom. p. 248.

tion of the two together, the prophecy and the history, as a conjunction intended by the Divine inditer of the Apocalypse, is that which should not only be rejected, but rejected with absolute “disgust,” by the gentle-minded, Dean of Canterbury.

Preliminarily let me suggest, what I do not think you will be inclined to dispute, that it seems to me manifestly consonant with good taste that in a series of symbolic picturings of great national subjects, whether historic or prophetic, there should be a certain regard to the national style of description and writing:—by the use, for example, generally of bolder combinations of imagery in the picturing of an Oriental people, and their achievements, than in that of a European people; as well as by a choice of particular symbols adopted by, or characteristic of, the people. Strikingly, in my opinion, has the Apocalyptic use of this principle been illustrated by what has already passed under review in the Apocalyptic figurations, supposing the explanations to be true that I have attached to them:—the symbolizations of Roman subjects being Roman-like, and Saracenic (as already just before noted) those of Saracenic subjects; not to add Israelitish, also, those of things concerning the Christian professing Israel. And so here, if at first sight the combination of imagery in the figuration of the 6th Trumpet appears strangely bold, and almost grotesque, its *general* appropriateness in this very respect, if meant of the *Turkman* people, may soon be made to appear. Take in illustration the descriptive passage in Saadeddin,—the prince, as he has been called, of *Ottoman* historians,—on the capture of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks; and compare its bold imagery, though but that of an historic description, with the prefigurative picturing of the same people and same event, as I understand it, in the Apocalypse. “The Moslems placed their cannon . . . before

the gates and ramparts of Constantinople. *The flame which issued from the mouths of those war-instruments of brazen bodies, and fiery jaws*, cast dismay among the misbelievers. The *smoke*, which spread itself in the air, rendered the brightness of day dark as night to the unhappy infidels." So the Turkish historian, Saadeddin.¹ And what the Apocalyptic symbolic prefiguration? "Thus I saw the horses in the vision, and those that sate on them, having *breastplates of fire*, and of jacinth, and of brimstone: and the heads of the horses were as the heads of lions, and *out of their mouths issued fire, and smoke, and brimstone*. By these three was the third part of men killed, by the fire, and by the smoke, and by the brimstone which issued out of their mouths." Is there not a sufficiently marked resemblance between the two citations to show the strikingly *Turkish* character of the Apocalyptic picturing?

But not merely was the actual destruction by the Turkman hordes of the Byzantine third of the old Roman empire to be foreshown in the Apocalyptic prefiguration, but (as in my opinion was to be expected from a *divine* foreshadowing of that eventful chapter of the coming future) much much more:—viz., the *local origin* of those fire-breathing destroying hordes, as *from the Euphrates*: their intimate connexion with the preceding but previously long-dormant 5th Trumpet-plague, figured by the declared loosing, on the occasion, of the four tempest-angels of the Trumpet-judgments from a previous binding (or restraint from action) by the Euphrates:—the *time* within which they were to kill the third part of the men of Roman Christendom, viz., a period very singularly defined as an "*hour, day, month, and year*:"—their subsequent habitual and authoritative injuring of those whose national life they would

¹ Given in my new edition, vol. i., p. 512.

previously have taken away, as indicated by the still more singular symbol of *serpent-like horsetails* to the Euphratean horses *having heads*, wherewith it was said (even as by their fire and smoke-breathing mouths in the first instance) they would injure, and do injustice.—And, now, to each and every one of these particulars in the Apocalyptic symbolization was there not an answering in the Turkmen's history, and their acting in the middle age against the Eastern Roman empire, and its professedly (though only professedly) Christian inhabitants? I think (and that more strongly even than before, since reading all that you have to object to my solution) that I have shown such to be the case.—Let me give a brief abstract of my evidence in proof; then an abstract of your objections.

(a) It is to be remembered, then, that it was on the Saracenic Mussulman Caliphs' settlement at *Bagdad on the Euphrates* in the 8th century that their once terrible plague ceased from Roman Christendom: the new capital, far removed from that of the Christians on the Bosphorus, being designated by the Caliphs themselves as *Medinat al Salem*, or *City of Peace*; and in the Caliphs' cultivation of the arts of peace there, then and thenceforward, the destroying angels bound, as it were, by the Euphrates. So was the Mahommedan plague stayed for some 200 or 300 years, and thus a long time of respite granted to Eastern Christendom. Then at length the Turkman hordes, coming down from Turkestan at the instance of the Bagdad Caliph to his assistance, there at once embraced the Mussulman faith; and, with a fury of fanaticism equal to that of the early Saracenic disciples of Mahomet, began again, with their cavalry hordes, the attacks on Eastern Christendom, as the natural foe and victim of Mahommedanism; and, spreading their conquests very soon throughout nearly the whole of Asia Minor, seemed even thus early as about

to overthrow the empire, and destroy, politically and nationally, that third of the Romans.¹ But,

(b) The *time* for effecting this was not as yet. "An hour and a day and a month and year,"—this was the singularly-defined period in the Apocalyptic prophecy, not till the ending of which the destruction of the third of men was to be accomplished; a period, on the year-day scale, equal to 396 years and 118 days. Accordingly, quite unlikely as it seemed in the early days of the Seljukian Turkmans' conquests in Asia Minor, first one and then another hindrance occurred to delay that catastrophe:—the irruption of Zenghis Khan, the Mogul Tartar, into the Seljukian kingdoms in Asia Minor; the invasion of the Crusading armies from the West; and then, finally, that of the Tartar Tamerlane. But, after that second Tartar tempest had swept by, the Ottoman Turks again began to press Constantinople, the great capital, and heart as it were of the life-blood of the Eastern empire; forming its siege *just 396 years* after the first loosing of their hordes, on the mission of the Caliph, from Bagdad on the Euphrates. For a while their success was doubtful. But the *fire and smoke-breathing artillery*, then first effectively used in siege warfare, proved irresistible. "After the 40th day of the siege," says Gibbon, "the fate of Constantinople could no longer be averted." On that day, I infer from Byzantine historians, the Emperor in despair offered to accept the Ottoman Sultan as his Suzerain, and rule only as Viceroy under him. Then, on the offer's rejection, began the death-throe, which ended ten days after, of Eastern Roman Christendom. And what the precise relationship of that 40th day of the siege to the Apocalyptic period? It was *that very day* that completed its 396 years and 118

¹ So Hos. xiii. 1. See note, p. 82, *suprà*.

² See Vol. i., p. 500, 4th Ed. ; p. 529, 5th Ed.

days; that very day that its aggregated “hour and day and month and year” expired.¹ Was this coincidence of time *chance*?

(c.) And indeed the very formula under which the Apocalyptic period is expressed is characteristically Turkman. Never but once have I read of a term in historic record similarly expressed; the one exception being that of the term of truce granted to our Richard Cœur de Lion by the Turkman Saladin; and therefore one characteristically *Turkman*. It was to be for “*three years and three months and three weeks and three days and three hours.*” So singular seemed to me the similarity, that I was at pains to verify it: for verification was needed, in consequence of the blundering of both French and English modern historians of the Crusades. But, as will be seen in my “H. A.,”² the verification was complete. And so this *Turkman* peculiarity of numeral phraseology, in solemn national transactions, has to be added to all the rest.

(d.) Such again, most certainly, was the *serpent-like horse-tails ending in heads*, of the symbol, with which it was said that the symbolized invading hordes of horses and horsemen from the Euphrates would do injury and injustice. For both in the Apocalypse, and elsewhere in prophetic Scripture, *heads* are notoriously the symbol of *governing authorities*; and, as notoriously, *horse-tails* have ever been the emblems of Turkman Pashas’ authority, and coincidently also, as the too general practice, of their misrule and injustice. Was there ever elsewhere a nation of historic fame to which this singular, most singular, emblem could be applied?

(e.) Nor can I omit to call attention, finally, to the very re-

¹ See the calculation, &c., vol. i., pp. 522—527. (5th Ed.)

² I think it will interest my readers generally to see in my “H. A.” the statement, and the resolution, of the difficulty in this incident of the history of Richard and Saladin.

markable manner in which, when declaring his mission against Roman Christendom as a nation of idolaters, Mahomet the Second, after his capture of Constantinople, unconsciously designated the people, and their saint and image-worship, almost in the very phraseology of the designation given them, as I doubt not, in the verses of the Apocalyptic prophecy next following after the statement of the destruction by the horses and horsemen from the Euphrates of *the third of men*. Said the *prophecy*: "And the rest of the men, which were not killed by these plagues, repented not of the *works of their hands*, that they should not worship *demons*, and *idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and wood*, which can neither see, nor hear, nor walk." Said the Turkish Sultan Mahomet, August 2, A.D. 1469, sixteen years after his capture of Constantinople and overthrow of the Greek Empire, as a vow which he caused to be published in all the mosques of his empire:—"I Mahomet, son of Amurath, . . . emperor of emperors, and prince of princes, from the rising to the setting sun, promise to the only God, Creator of all things, by my vow and by my oath, that I will not give sleep to my eyes, nor seek out what is pleasant, nor touch what is beautiful, nor turn my face from the West to the East, till I overthrow, and trample under the feet of my horses, the *gods of the heathen*;—those *gods of wood, of brass, of silver, of gold, or of painting*, which the disciples of Christ have *made with their hands*."

And now then, Mr. Dean, I have to ask what are the *objections* that you have to offer to all these coincidences? For, as to *counter-solution*, you have confessedly here, just as in the Trumpet previous, none.

To my *literal* construction of the *Euphratean locality*, as that whence the *symbolized* invading hordes of the horses and horsemen of the 6th Trumpet were to issue, you make

no objection. On the contrary, you distinctly admit its scripturalness. "It is a common feature," you say, "of Scripture allegory to intermingle with its mystic language literal descriptions of *place* and *time*." ¹

Against my explanation of "the four angels bound in the Euphrates, that had to be loosed as the four tempest-angels of judgment, first commissioned at the beginning of the Trumpets," you thus object:²—"We must not yield to the temptation, so attractive at first sight, of identifying these four angels with the four angels holding in the four winds in Apoc. vii.: for the mission of these angels is totally distinct from theirs, as the locality is also; there being not a syllable here of *winds*, nor any hurting of earth, sea, or trees." But, let me ask, was there not an identity of object in the judicial mission of the four tempest-angels of Apoc. vii. and that of the destroyers of the 5th and 6th Trumpets;—this being in each case a mission against those who had not the seal of God on their foreheads, as appears from comparing Apoc. vii. 3, ix. 4, 20, 21?

As regards the term of time you construe the *εις την ὥραν και ἡμεραν και μηνα και ενιαυτον* as simply meaning "*against, or in reference to, the hour day month and year* appointed [such you make the force of the prefixed article] by God:"—a sense self-refuted by the fact that so every additional term, after the first, would be but *tautology*. Then, as against *my* construction of the clause, you add; "Had there been no article, we *might* have understood (with Mr. E.) that the four were to be added together to make up the time:" its insertion, however, in your opinion, negating the idea. Is there then reason in this objection? The reader should remember, with reference to the *εις* as marking either the length or the ending point of the aggregated term of time, my parallel phrases from Dan. xii.

¹ Comment., p. 642.

² Ibid.

in the Septuagint; *εις καιρον και καιρους και ἡμισυ καιρου*; and, *μακαριος ὁ φθασας εις ἡμερας χιλιας τριακοσιας πεντε*: the *εις* in the one case marking *duration*, as in the sense *for*; in the other the ending point of the term, in the sense *at*, or *at the lapse of*. Now, then, does the article prefix here bear me out, as you assert, from the latter sense? Let us see. As regards then the effect of the one article before the whole clause, I make reference in the "H. A." (a reference unnoticed by you) to the parallel passage of Apoc. v. 12, *την δυναμιν και πλουτον και σοφιαν και ισχυν* the one article prefix, alike in either of the two passages, governing and binding together as one, I there argue, "even as under a bracket," all the aggregated accusatives. Do you dispute the justice of this criticism? Let me beg to refer to the corroboration of an expositor for whose opinion you will perhaps have some deference, that expositor being none other than Dean Alford. You say, on Apoc. v. 12; "Here one article includes all these nouns. Bengel well remarks that we must regard them all *as if they formed but one word*." Just so in the passage before us. The one article embraces all the terms of time, as if one aggregated word. And then, as to the effect of the one article on the aggregated accusatives of time following, it is that which the same Dean Alford expresses, in the words cited just above, precisely as the Author of the "Horæ" had expressed it before him; viz., as on the expiration of *the hour day month and year*, "*appointed by God*."

Finally, as regards my explanation of the *horsetails having heads*, after exclaiming against it, in the quotations from your Book already made, as "a culminating instance of incongruity of interpretation," "self-refuted, &c.,"—mere words these of objurgation, but with no argument in them, and consequently worthless,—you most reprehensibly assert that "it is convicted [*i.e.*, of error] by leaving altogether

out of view the power in the *mouths*, which is the principal feature in the original vision, and by making no reference to the serpent-like character of the tails, but being wholly inconsistent with it," which statements are each and either, just like that other respecting my Saracenic solution,¹ wholly untrue:—the fact being that I dwell *at large* on each of these points in the prophetic figuration, as not only not inconsistent with, but strikingly accordant with my Turkish explanation of it; ² indeed *strong points in my case*. Your vain attempt at refuting it only makes me feel as I before intimated, more strongly than ever the irrefragable strength of evidence arising out of this most wonderful coincidence, connected as it is with so many other wonderful coincidences, in proof of the truth of the *Turkman* reference of the Apocalyptically prefigured horses and horsemen from the Euphrates.³

And were all these historic coincidences with the 6th Trumpet figuration, thus shown to be unrefuted and irrefutable, as well as all connected with the previous Trumpet figurations, simply the result of *chance*?

I am, dear Mr. Dean,

Yours faithfully,

E. B. ELLIOTT.

¹ See p. 82 *suprà*.

² On the power in their mouths I dwell at large, Vol. i., pp. 481—484; on the serpent-like, envenomed, and injurious character of what was symbolized by the headed horsetails, viz., the Turkish Pashas' government, pp. 486, 487, 4th Ed. (I refer to that Edition as that which you had before you.)

³ You add: "By distorting too the canon of symmetrical interpretation, in making the heads attached to the tails to mean that the tails are symbols of authority." I think the Dean and this his symmetrical Canon may be as well left to themselves, till the former better explains the latter.

LETTER II.

ALFORDIAN CASE AGAINST MY EXPLANATION IN THE "H.A."
OF THE DRAGON, THE BEAST, AND THE TWO WITNESSES.

DEAR MR. DEAN,

Now for the explanation in the "H. A." of the large and all-important subject of the APOCALYPTIC BEAST; including its adjuncts of the DRAGON of Apoc. xii., the Beast's precursor and evoker, and Christ's TWO SACKCLOTH-ROBED WITNESSES told of in Apoc. xi., the objects of persecution by the Beast, even unto death. In each of which cases, as before, I shall have to note the evidence propounded in support of my explanation; and then your objections, and adverse criticisms, against it.

And I think that, in here meeting you, it may be well to speak of the above-mentioned three chief constituent topics of that great subject of the Apocalyptic prophecy in their *chronological* order:—*i.e.*, of the *Dragon* of Apoc. xii. first; of the *Beast* as figured in Apoc. xiii. and xvii. next; of the *Witnesses*, warred against and at length slain by the Beast, last. But not so without first suggesting, what will more fully appear under my 3d head afterwards, a certain accordance with historic fact observable in the very order of arrangement in the Apocalyptic unfolding of the subject:—there being given in the prophecy, first, on the grand figured theatre of the world and Church visible, a symbolization of the *Reformation* in all its chief successive stages of progress, as quick following after the destruction of the third of men, or Greek Empire, under the 6th Trumpet;

and then, and thereupon, a *general* revelation, in the light of the now opened Gospel, both of the Papal pretended VICAR OF CHRIST, with the Western kingdoms supporting him, as the long-predicted ANTICHRISTIAN BEAST; and also of a spare witness-line for Christ's truth in previous ages, as warred against to the death by him, till at length, in the very Reformation itself, revived in greater strength than before :—but not till after the 7th Trumpet's sounding, or (historically interpreted) the great French Revolution, in a supplemental series of visions, such as was evidently needed for the purpose, a full illustration, *in all its details*, of the origin, history, character, and actings of that Antichristian Papal Beast; of which series the chronological parallelism with the times and history of the Witnesses, in the former series, was shown by the similarly-involved period of the 1,260 days, or years.¹—This premised, proceed we now to the development of the subject in these full supplemental visions.—And,

Ist, the introductory vision of the SEVEN-HEADED DRAGON and TRAVAILING SUN-CLOTHED WOMAN in Apoc. xii.

Of the utter failure of your attempt at explaining the opening part of this vision as meant of the Jewish Church's travailing in hope of the Messiah, and the man-child Jesus Christ's birth, his persecution by Satan through Roman official agencies, and at length ascension to the throne of God, I have already spoken before; as also of that of your connectedly attempted reference of the Woman's flight, in the latter part of the vision, to the early Christian Church's flight to Pella from the horrors of the siege of Jerusalem :—a failure not on one point, but on all. So that there is

¹ How near you approach to the *year-day* theory of the great prophetic chronological periods may be seen by reference to what I have stated from your Book, p. 41, *suprà*; though elsewhere formally, and not very consistently, (see my citation Note ², p. 75, *suprà*,) rejecting both the literal *day-day* theory and the *year-day*.

here no counterview in the Apocalypsis Alfordiana of the slightest plausibility to oppose to that in the "H. A."¹ My own view (as was also just hinted before)² is to the effect that, *at its opening*, the vision under consideration figured the last struggles of Satan, as animating Roman Heathendom, against advancing Christianity, and when the still orthodox and united Church was in strong travail with the hope of a Christian prince being elevated to the supreme and thenceforth Christianized throne of the Roman world:—also that in its *later* figurations it signified the efforts of the same Satanic spirit, after dejection from the imperial throne, against Christ's faithful Catholic Church; and success, through floods of heresies schisms and heathen invaders, poured out against her from his mouth, in driving her into a state of invisibility and desolation. And the historic interpretation, given in the "H. A." to this effect, having, as I said, no counterview of the slightest plausibility to contrast with it, has to be judged of by the strength simply of its own supporting evidence, compared with the strength of the objections urged against that evidence.

Now, in order to judge of the truth of my interpretation of the *former* part of the vision, we must, as before, see whether the coincidences urged in the "H. A." between

¹ See pp. 32—34, *suprà*.—After reading the *exposé* there given of your interpretation of the visions in this chapter (and I must beg a reference to it at this point of the discussion), it will, I think, be alike surprising and amusing to the general reader to observe the tone of confidence with which you refer to it, as if so palpably plain and satisfactory as of itself to set aside all counter-views. "The man-child is the Lord Jesus Christ, *and none other*." "The man-child's birth *must* be understood literally and historically of *that* birth of which all Christians know;" and "his being caught up to God, and his throne, of Jesus Christ's being taken up to heaven, and sitting on the right hand of God." "This forms one of the *landmarks* by which the legitimacy of various interpretations may be tested; and of which we may say that every interpretation which oversteps their measure is thereby convicted of error." Comment., p. 665.

² P. 48, *suprà*.

the prophecy and history are distinct, peculiar, consistent, decisive. Taking, then, for granted that by the *Woman* is meant the Christian faithful Church, seeing that she is spoken of afterwards as the mother of “them that observe the commandments of God, and keep the testimony of Jesus Christ,” and by the seven-headed *Dragon* Satan, as inspiring and acting in the heathen Roman empire, its seven heads and ten horns being the *Roman* designative in the symbol of the Beast next following,—neither of which points you would be inclined to dispute,¹—the chronological crisis figured is by the following very peculiar and characteristic points of evidence *fixed*, in my opinion, to Constantinian times, and the last struggles in those times of Roman Heathenism, headed by Maximin, and then Licinius, against Christianity and the Christian Church.

1st, as Whiston and Bishop Newton have observed, the time of the Church’s travailing, or 40th week of gestation, calculated on the year-day prophetic chronological scale from Christ’s ascension, was now just expiring; the date of Christ’s ascension being about A.D. 33, that of the Constantinian Decree in favour of Christianity, and of Maximin’s war immediately afterwards, A.D. 313.

2. Construing the *heaven* spoken of as the Apocalyptic firmamental heaven, that same in which the stars also spoken of seemed set, and so, agreeably with its use both in the Apocalypse and other Scriptures, as the symbolic region

¹ Of the seven-headed *Dragon* you say, “The Dragon being the Devil, these symbolic features of the seven heads and ten horns must be interpreted . . . as indicating that he lays wait for the woman’s offspring *in the form of that Antichristian power* (viz. the *Roman*) which is afterwards represented by the Beast.”

The *Woman* you yourself interpret, in all but the introductory scene of the figurations in Apoc. xii., as the faithful *Christian professing Church*: the exigences of your interpretation of the man-child’s birth forcing you, in that single introductory scene of the vision, very inconsistently to make it the Old Testament *Jewish Church*.

of political elevation and power,¹ the enigma which by a modern Commentator of some note² was declared insoluble, viz., that the Christian Church and Roman heathen Dragon should be at the same time in the same heaven, receives its solution from indisputable historic fact; for, at the time referred to, such was precisely the political status alike of Christ's Church in one part of the Roman Empire, and of the heathen power in another. Nor this alone; but, 3dly, and yet more exactly, Heathenism had then supremacy in but *one-third* of the Roman world, viz., the eastern third, ruled over by Maximin, just accordantly with the prophetic figuration of the Dragon, as then drawing but one-third of the stars of heaven; while Christianity was in the ascendant in the other two-thirds, or the dominions of Constantine and Licinius. 4. At that time, agreeably with the Dragon's notable *seven-headed* appearance in vision, the Roman Empire had, in place of the old monarchical Imperial headship, or sixth ruling headship on Rome's seven hills, such as in St. John's time was in power, come recently under a *seventh*, viz., that of the Imperial quadripartite form of government planned by Diocletian:³ and, 5thly, of this new or seventh headship the badge (contradictorily to all earlier Roman feeling and precedent) was the badge here seen upon the Dragon's heads, not of the old Imperial *laurel crown*, but of the autocratic Asiatic *diadem*.⁴ 6. The throne of the great Roman world, after the Christian Constantine's elevation to it, subsequently to his successive overthrows of the successive heathen emperors of the eastern third, Maximin and

¹ Of this more presently, under the head of objections.

² Faber.

³ See p. 67, *suprà*.

⁴ The force of the evidence hence arising is doubled, and quadrupled, by the similar most remarkable correspondence with historic fact of the same *diademic* symbol as apparent on the *ten horns* of the seven-headed Beast, when first emerging from the sea, in Apoc. xiii. Of this I shall have to speak under my next head in this Letter.

Licinius, (the latter after his apostasy from the Christian faith,) was celebrated by the Christians of the time as the throne of one who felt and ruled on it as but the Lord's deputy, just after the precedents of David's and Solomon's divinely-instituted thrones, each called the *Lord's throne*; and, 7thly, the Christian orthodox baptized emperor, still agreeably with the language of this Apocalyptic figuration, was called a "*Son of the Church*."¹ 8. Notwithstanding this, the Satan-animated heathen power, in the person of Julian, (not to speak of the preparation for this in the Arianism of Constantius,) made yet another war in the elevated region of the political heaven, (so as here prefigured,) for the recovery of its supremacy in the Roman world; but in vain: the result being that the Dragon was cast down from its elevation, never to rise to it again. 9. Both in Constantine's time, after the overthrow of Maximin and Licinius, and in Jovian's, after the overthrow of Julian, the Apocalyptic imagery was adopted by the chief Christian writers of the time, and the fall of Heathenism celebrated as the fall of the Dragon: besides that both in a Constantinian picture before the Imperial palace in Constantinople, and on medals of the Imperial coinage still extant, the Dragon was represented as cast down under the Christian standard of the labarum; or, otherwise, as trampled underfoot by a labarum-bearing Christian emperor.²

Such is the evidence given in the "II. A." in support of this my explanation of the *primary* part of the Apocalyptic figuration of the Woman and Dragon. And what then have you to say against it?

In answer to this question the simple truth is that you

¹ On these points the reader will do well to look at the illustrations *ad loc.* in the "Horæ Apoc.," from Eusebius, Ambrose, &c.

² I must here again refer to the illustrations, both patristic and medallie, given *ad loc.* in the "II. A."

offer no objection against any one point in it. Apparently deeming it sufficient to set forth in contrast your own most palpably inadmissible solution of the vision, (as I have shown it to be,)¹ together with a somewhat contemptuous allusion to my notice of the elevation of "a son of the Church, a baptized emperor, to political supremacy in the Roman empire," as if an event unworthy to be designated as a mighty result, such as to deserve notice in the Apocalyptic figurings of the coming future,² (an intimation in which, as so often elsewhere, you are certainly inconsistent with yourself, as well as with common sense and Holy Scripture,)³ you pass over all these points of evidence, just as over so many others spoken of before, absolutely in silence. Insomuch that it is perfectly a marvel with me how to reconcile this with what nevertheless, I doubt not, is really and essentially your character, viz., that of a lover of truth. Nor do I see any way of reconciling things so contradictory *primâ facie*, except by supposing you to have drawn up your Apocalyptic Commentary with a haste and inconsiderateness altogether unbecoming a Christian expositor of Scripture; or else to have naturally a mental inaptitude for the perception, and right appreciation and use, of the evidence of truth.

There is just one point indeed, I see, in the prophetic figuration, unnoticed by me above, to which you advert as a decisive corroboration of your view of the Apocalyptic man-child as *Christ*; viz., his being declaredly destined to rule

¹ See, as before, pp. 32—34, *suprà*:—also my citations from your Commentary in Note ¹, p. 95.

² So Comment., p. 665.

³ With *yourself*, for you suppose the event to be expressly symbolized in the fall of one and rise of another head of the Apocalyptic Beast:—with common sense, for the best historians under its direction observe on it as one of the mightiest events in history:—with Scripture, for there by his prophets God speaks of such events; *e. g.* of the raising up of Cyrus to supremacy in the Persian empire, for the deliverance of his Jewish people.

the Gentiles, or heathen, with a rod of iron, agreeably with the language respecting Christ in the 2d Messianic Psalm. But, as I have in my "H. A." observed, the Psalmist's prophecy seems to be meant partly, and perhaps primarily, of Christ's subjugating and ruling heathen powers of the world with the rod of severe repression *through human agency*; (so various Commentators of repute explain it:)¹ and that such was the case in the dealing of Roman orthodox Christian emperors after Constantine with the still profest heathens in the empire is notorious. To which let me add that such a passage in the Apocalyptic figuration must be judged of not by itself, but as associated with the other many and various indications of the thing and person meant that are given in connexion with it. And, let me repeat, the very primary point in the vision of the *Apocalyptic heaven* being the scene in which both the Dragon and the Woman were conflicting at the time that the vision referred to, suffices of itself to warn us off from all direct *Messianic* explanation of the man-child here spoken of.

And this suggests to me that it may be well to observe here on a point of considerable importance towards the right understanding of the Apocalyptic visions, with which, as it is evident, you have not duly acquainted yourself,² viz., the scenery, both earthly and heavenly, connected with the figurations in them. In those of the chapter now under review both the Dragon and the Woman are represented as

¹ *E.g.*, in the case of David and Solomon, as ruling over the subjugated heathen in their kingdoms. See my "H. A." vol. iii. p. 29 (5th Ed.)—In Apoc. ii. 27 *the saints*, I there observe, are spoken of by Christ as having power given them over the heathen (εθνη), and that they shall "rule them with a rod of iron." I also cite the observation of Daubuz, that in this passage in Apoc. xii. it is only the former part of the prophecy in Ps. ii. that is quoted; viz., that of the ruling with a rod of iron; not that about "breaking in pieces as a potter's vessel."

² This is one of the points of omission in your Commentary on the Apocalypse alluded to by me at p. 50, *suprà*.

first apparent in the *heaven* of vision, then on its *earth*;—the Dragon having been forcibly ejected from the one to the other. On this you thus far justly remark, p. 664; "Heaven is here manifestly not only the *show-place* of the visions, *as seen by the Seer*,¹ but *has a substantial place in the vision*; for, in verse 9, we have the heaven contrasted with the earth, and the Dragon cast out of heaven into the earth." But how confused and erroneous is your idea of this heaven of the Apocalyptic visions appears sufficiently (not to add other proof)² from your making the heaven here figured to be the heaven of God's beatific presence:—that same, you say, in which Satan was figured in Job and Zachariah as accusing Job and Joshua the high priest respectively; and here as the accuser of the Christians' brethren before God. But how then was *the Woman*, whether the Jewish Church, or Eve, *in this same heaven*? And how *in this same heaven* the scene of her parturition, and of *Jesus Christ's natural birth*? On this question of overwhelming difficulty you, with more of discretion than valour, say not one word. Now, from simply noting down all that is said in the successive visions of the Apocalyptic scenery, it will appear clearly that, after St. John's being first caught up through the door opened in heaven, there appeared as it were another world, like that which we now inhabit, before him; with *its own firmamental heaven*, as

¹ You allude, I presume, to what was said to St. John introductorily to the visions of the future, Apoc. iv. 1, "Come up hither," viz., through the door opened *in heaven*, "and I will show thee the things which must be hereafter."

² So, *e.g.*, in your remarks at p. 592, on "the door (Apoc. iv. 1) being opened in heaven." "Here the *heaven*, or *house or palace of God*, remains firmly shut to those on earth: but a door is opened, and the Seer is rapt in the Spirit through it. Henceforth usually he looks from the heaven *down on the earth*; seeing however both alike, and being present in either, as the localities of his various visions require." Thus the Apocalyptic *heaven* is defined by you to be the high and holy place, *opened only in vision*, of God's presence; but the Apocalyptic *earth* as the *actual earth* on which we tread.

well as its own *earth*; and all the various adjuncts which here meet our eyes in association with both the one and the other:—

Hi cœlum, solemque suum, sua sidera norunt :

a ready material this for many most important figurations of the Apocalyptic prophecy; just as was that which we have here around and above us to the Old Testament prophets: there being however this addition to the rest quite peculiar to itself;—that *a temple*, like the Jewish temple or tabernacle, appeared a fixture in the foreground, (of which more in a later part of this Letter,) with the three several divisions of the Altar-court, the Holy Place, with its candlestick and golden-incense altar, and the Holy of Holies with God's throne in it: which last, agreeably with the symbolic intent ascribed by St. Paul in the Hebrews to the Holy of Holies in the old Jewish Tabernacle, is *the Apocalyptic heaven of God's throne and presence*, with angels and beatified saints as its inhabitants. So indeed in the visions of the Old Testament prophets; “The Lord is in *his holy temple*; the Lord's throne is in *heaven*.” And in the Apocalyptic vision; “A throne was set *in heaven*:” a description followed afterwards by notice of certain *temple* adjuncts; as of the ark materially, and of the attendant angelic company, such as in the heavenly temple seen in vision by Isaiah.¹

Now then, except where God's throne is referred to as there, or one or other of its perpetual Apocalyptic accompaniments, it is evident that we should construe the heaven spoken of as the Apocalyptic firmamental heaven. So of the phenomena of the sun, moon, and stars, in the figurative imagery of the 6th Seal, and that of the Trumpets. So of the angels, and the birds of prey, seen flying in mid-heaven.² So here, of the elevated position of both the Woman and

¹ Isaiah vi.

² Apoc. viii. 13, xiv. 6, xix. 17.

Dragon in the same firmamental heaven, as figurative of political elevation; and again of the deprest condition of the Woman, when seen on earth, as well as of the fall from heaven to earth of the Apocalyptic Dragon; just as of the star of Apoc. ix. 1 before it. The point is one of prime importance in Apocalyptic interpretation; and your own Exposition has suffered much from your not attending to it. Obvious as the fact is, your non-observance of it seems to me surprising: and the more surprising, and the more regrettable, because of its being a point worked out with its proofs from the Apocalypse itself in other Commentaries, especially my own, which were in your hands when writing;—to which, however, whether from undue haste, or inconsideration, you failed of attending.

As to the *second* part of this vision, respecting *the Woman's flight towards the wilderness*, and *fallen Dragon's attempt at destroying her in her flight*, I have no need to dwell at any length upon it. For here, after pretty much discarding your primary application of the figuration to the early Christian Church's flight to Pella, you finally intimate a suspicion that, "after all,"¹ it may be meant of precisely that which I explain it to mean, viz., of "the true visible Church, which, as established by Christ and his apostles, continued in unbroken unity during the first centuries; but which, as time went on, was broken up by evil men and evil doctrines, and has since remained unseen, unrealized, with her unity an article of faith, not of sight: but still multiplying her seed, those who keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus, in various sects and distant countries: waiting the day for her comely order and oneness again to be manifested; the day when she shall come up out of the wilderness leaning on her Beloved." And the time for "the great realization," or

¹ Comment., p. 671.

consummation, of this her entrance on the wilderness-state of invisibility, you define, like myself, as “the seventh century;” construing the blood cast out of the Dragon’s mouth against her, just similarly in regard to the *general* intent of the symbol, though differently in regard to the *particular* historical application, of the irruption into Christendom of the Mohammedan armies.¹ Thus, my own real explanation of this part of the vision being admitted by you, in regard of its main points, as that which “after all” you have been led to think may be its true explanation, I have little to do comparatively in answering objections from your pen against it. A few observations only seem required, to show in contrast *my* consistency on this point of near agreement between us, and indeed in the whole exposition of the Apocalyptic vision; *your* inconsistency.

It is distinctly to be observed, I must premise, that this is, as I have said, my *real* explanation of this part of the vision; more especially as regards *the Woman*, the most prominent of the figures and actors in it. For, by a strange and really inexcusable misrepresentation, you make me to explain the Woman as figuring “the *invisible* Church of God’s true people, which under all conditions of the world can be known only to Him.”² Judge yourself if it be not inexcusable; considering that not only do I again and again in my two chapters on Apoc. xii. define my idea of the Woman as Christ’s *true, orthodox, visible, catholic Church* of the

¹ Comment., p. 671.

² So *ib.*, p. 670. “If we bring down the event answering to the Woman’s flight into the wilderness as late as Elliott does, *i. e.*, to the period between the 4th and 7th centuries, we fall, besides other difficulties into this one, that if the occultation of true religion, or its equivalent *the similar condition of the invisible Church*, was the beginning of the wilderness state, then” one of two alternatives must follow, “either of which would hardly be allowed by that author.” And, in reference evidently to the same view, just before ascribed to me, you note, at p. 671, in contrast to it, “the *true visible Church*; not the invisible Church of God’s true people, which, under all conditions of the world, must be known only to Him.”

4th century, distinguishing it expressly from the *invisible Church* made up alone of true-hearted Christians,¹ but that that idea runs through my whole historical sketch of the Christian Church Catholic in the 4th and 5th centuries, as answering to what is predicated of the mystical Woman in her various prefigured phases and fortunes.

This premised, observe, 1st, how completely and perfectly the *Woman's individuality of character* is preserved in my exposition of the vision. It is not, as with you, the *Jewish Church visible*, a Church notoriously corrupt in respect both of doctrine and character, so as at the time of Christ's birth, that is supposed to be represented by her, to begin with; and then, afterwards, the *faithful Christian Church visible*:—but, to begin, the *Christian Catholic Church visible* of the early Constantinian æra, *purified* in the general character of its members by the long general and fierce Diocletianic persecution, immediately previous; and with the witness to both its *universality* and its *true orthodoxy*, alike in respect of doctrine and worship, of the great Œcumenic Nicene Council.

Observe, 2dly, the *continuity* and *consistency*, as well as *historic truth*, of the prefigurative sketch of the faithful Christian Church's subsequent fortunes and history, from after its commencing epoch, on my understanding of the vision. On yours what a vast and unaccountable gap and void is

¹ So first at p. 7 of vol. iii. of the "H. A." (4th Ed., that which was in your hands when you wrote); "The Woman was evidently *Christ's true visible Church on earth*." In a Note to which clause I expressly distinguish between it and St. Paul's ideal mother Church of the Jerusalem that is above, thus:—"The *latter* includes all the Lord's saints of all the successive generations of the world; the *former* those only that are alive at any particular time on earth, and this with reference to their *corporate* or *Church* character: further, the *latter* is pure from all admixture of evil; while the *former* has admixture not only from the remaining sin of true Christians, but also from the adhesion to it always, more or less, of orthodox but unsound professors."

there in it:—even the Church's glorious apostolic times and history, immediately following after Christ's ascension, being passed over unprefigured; and nothing indicated as destined to the Church after his ascension, but a movement soon begun towards a state of invisibility, and completed, under the effect of the Dragon's persecutions, in the 7th century!! On the other hand, as explained in the “*Horæ*,” the Woman's speedy transference, after the man-child's birth and enthronization, from her primarily depicted state of brightness and exaltation to a lower earthly state of depression, and the commencing obscuration of her most distinctive features, as if with a flight already beginning towards the wilderness, had its counterpart in the depression of the Nicene faithful Church under the advancement of Arianism, within but a few years of the death of Constantine, and obscuration at least, if not loss for the time, of her previously marked feature of *catholicity*.—Next,—agreeably with that expressive song of the voices of Christians triumphing over heathenism in the firmamental heaven in vision,¹ after the figured war in heaven, and final dejection of the Dragon, “Our brethren overcame him by virtue of the blood of the Lamb, and of *their own witnessing even unto death*,”²—there became strikingly prominent in the history

¹ Here observe the importance of a right understanding of the heaven of the Apocalyptic imagery. See p. 102, *suprà*.—Thus it is not the voice of the 24 *elders*, so as you explain it, whose presence was ever in the figurative Holy of Holies, in the Apocalyptic temple, before the throne of God.—See too the remarks under my third main head, *infra*, on the Apocalyptic temple in vision.

² We are indebted to Mr. Biley for this striking and most just inference from the song in question. The more I consider it the more I admire both the Divine prescience in the prefiguration, and the discernment given to his servant for its right interpretation.—Compare, in the chronologically parallel series of visions, the correspondent indications of the early corruption of professing Roman Christendom, after the great Constantinian revolution, in the sealing vision first, and the incense-offering vision afterwards. This is just alluded to p. 69, *suprà*.

and character of the professing Church from after Julian's overthrow, in the second half of the 4th century, a superstitious veneration of departed martyrs for the faith, even as if conjointly with Christ the authors of Christianity's victory over Heathenism;¹ and so, through that ever increasing martyr and saint-venerating superstition, a correspondently ever increasing indistinctness and obscurity in the Christian Church, visible before the world, of its old feature of *evangelic faithfulness and purity*, in regard alike of doctrine and worship.

3. Even though you decline to understand the *two wings of the great eagle* given to the Woman in the Apocalyptic figuration, to assist in preserving her vitality in the flight from the Dragon's pursuit, of any *Roman* imperial intervention in favour of the Christian Catholic Church, yet some striking *Providential* intervention in its favour, with that result (like as in the case of God's intervention for preserving Israel in its flight from Pharaoh), you find yourself obliged to recognise in the aptation to the Woman of the eagle-wings of the symbol; and also to seek something that might answer in the history of the times which your solution embraces to that of *the earth's absorbing the floods* cast out of the Dragon's mouth against the Woman. And, as what might perhaps historically answer to the *latter*, you suggest the fact of Roman Heathendom's "persecutions of the Church becoming absorbed by the civil power turning *Christian*,"² *i.e.*, in the Constantinian revolution: but, as fulfilling the earlier figured intervention in the Woman's favour, find nothing correspondent in the previous history of the Church.—On the contrary, in *my* solution of the whole vision, how simply does the historic answer on either point suggest itself, just at the precise chronological

¹ This is fully illustrated in the "H. A."

² Comment., p. 669.

epoch suitable. Thus to the *giving of the wings of the great eagle* to the Woman, before the flood's ejection from the Dragon's mouth, there is that of Theodosius the Great's very remarkable and effective intervention in favour of the imperilled faithful Nicene Church, when Emperor of both Eastern and Western Divisions of the Roman World, by the calling of the second great Ecumenic Council, A.D. 385, just before the Gothic irruptions, which re-affirmed its doctrine, and re-asserted its catholicity: (and Roman medals of the time still extant, let me say, illustrate the applicability to the two Empires of the symbol of two wings, such as of the eagle :)¹—with the added aid too of the great Augustine, rendered possible only by the brief respite from the overwhelming of those barbarian invasions effected by 'Theodosius' victories. Also to the *earth's absorption of the flood*, subsequently, there is that of the Gothic heathen or Arian invaders of Western Roman Christendom laying aside at length the Arianism and Heathenism which had previously made them bitter persecutors of the faithful Church; and themselves, in the end of the 6th century, one after another, adopting the Nicene faith of the conquered kingdoms.

4. But, just as that consummation was taking place, the recognition also took place of the *Popes of Rome* as *Jesus Christ's plenipotentiary Vicars on earth*, and of their *pseudo-Catholic Church* as the real one, instead of the *old Nicene Catholic Evangelic Church*; whence a fit commencing epoch to the 1260 years of the true Catholic Church's pre-figured total withdrawal from men's sight, like Israel's of old in the invisibility of the wilderness;—a period this of 1260 years, commensurate alike with that predicated of

¹ One of these medals of the time will be found given in the 5th Edition of the "H. A."

the Papal Antichrist's supremacy in power,—that of pseudo-*Christian* Gentiles treading down the symbolic Holy City, or polity of the faithful,—and that of Christ's true witnessing servants (those children of the Woman that were destined to keep up the testimony for Jesus Christ in the long and sad interim) witnessing in sackcloth.¹ You have of course, on your principle of exposition, nothing definite to suggest on this head. Nor,

5thly, is there any contradiction to this, so as you assert, from the open establishment of orthodox Evangelic Protestant Churches some three centuries before the lapse of the 1260 years at the Reformation.² For these were but detached, sectional, or perhaps national Churches;—the Lutheran Church, the Genevese, the Anglican, the Scotch, the Moravian; each, though one and all essentially evangelic and true in doctrine, with their own particular articles of faith, and forms of worship. The faithful Catholic Evangelic Church, constituting one visible corporate body, and embracing, so as in early Constantinian times, the whole of professing *Christendom*, is still an invisibility. And such doubtless it will continue to be, until HE that is to come shall come: and then, more beautiful than ever, and as embracing the whole world, even as one Christendom, she shall "come out of the

¹ The *connexion* of these witnesses with the faithful Church Catholic, and also the *distinction* between the one and the other, as here indicated, is most observable.

² "On Elliott's most unsatisfactory explanation, if the occultation of true religion (= the condition of the *invisible* Church) was the beginning of the wilderness-state, then either the open establishment of the Protestant Churches was the end of the wilderness-state of concealment, or those Churches are not true Churches; either of which alternatives would hardly be allowed by that author." Comment., 670.

It is really alike strange and painful that any one whom we respect should make such misrepresentations; (see this noted p. 104, *suprà*;) and, on the basis of the misrepresentation, argue so inaccurately and unfairly against another expositor.

wilderness” (as you, *after myself*, apply the Scripture passage) “leaning on the Beloved.”

II. Now turn we to my explanation of THE APOCALYPTIC BEAST, and your objections against it:—a large subject this; but which may be the more briefly despatched, as the argument on it has been already in some measure forestalled.

It may be remembered that one essential in my view of the requirements of the Apocalyptic symbol was this,—that the *seven kings*, or *ruling authorities*, declared by the Angel to be one point signified by the Beast’s seven heads, ought each, and every one, to be attached to the locality of *Rome’s seven hills*, that being the second characteristic point said to be signified by them:—also that it was your objection against my application of the symbol, so construed, to the several successive headships of supreme authorities ruling at Rome,—five of which had *fallen* ere St. John’s time, viz., kings, consuls, dictators, decemvirs, military tribunes, while the 6th or imperial headship then was,—I say that it was your objection to this that the expression *fallen* was not applicable to a constitutional change of government, but only to a fallen kingdom, or individual fallen king.¹ Your own answer to your own objection was presently after hinted by me; inasmuch as you yourself apply the expression to the *change of religion* in the Roman empire from Heathenism to Christianity, though the empire afterwards still stood as before.² But really where the change of government is one of importance, the application of the word *fallen* to that which has been superseded is both natural and common. Said Cicero to his friend, after the old republican form of government at Rome had been

¹ See p. 39 *suprà*.

² See p. 42.

superseded by the usurping triumvirate of Octavius, Antony and Lepidus, "*Ea tua laus pariter cum Reipublicâ cecidit.*"¹ And do we not in the English history of the 17th century naturally speak of the *monarchy* falling with Charles the First, the *Protectorate* with Cromwell's son: and in the French history of the 18th and 19th centuries, of the falling successively of the *Monarchy*, the *Directory*, the *Consulate*, the *Emperorship*?² Said Burke in cognate phrase with reference, not to Louis the Sixteenth's execution on the scaffold, but to the National Assembly's memorable Act, some time before, of August 4, 1789, abolishing the old laws of the nation, privileges of the nobility, and monarch's supremacy, "Absolute monarchy then *breathed its last* (in France) without a struggle." Even as I write, an obituary notice by the "Times'" Correspondent from Paris of the just deceased nonagenarian statesman, Duke Pasquier, speaks of his having beheld the glories of the first empire, and *its fall*; as also "the Republic once more forced on the Country against its wishes, and its easy *overthrow*" by Prince Louis Napoleon.³

The objection is on a point so exceedingly important in the interpretation of the Apocalyptic symbol now before us, that I have thought it right to give it its full prominence. And, having now shown its futility, we may consider all reasons that you have to offer against my general explanation of the Beast's first six heads as answering to Rome's successive headships of kings, consuls, &c.,⁴ sufficiently refuted. And, since most certainly, as was just intimated in a former Letter,⁵ the Beast itself ought naturally to have applied to *it* the symbol of its own heads in their declared double sense, we may conclude also that that explanation is distinctly the true one; I mean as contrasted with that

¹ De Off. ii. 13.

² On the French Revolution.

³ "Times" of July 7 or 8, 1862.

⁴ Those "capita rerum," as Livy calls them. ⁵ See pp. 38, 39 *suprà*.

German and Anglo-Germanic solution preferred by you, which, setting aside from the Beast itself the fixed Roman seven-hilled location of its seven heads, explains it and them of the seven chief successive monarchies rising up, and falling, in quite different parts of the world.¹

Of the Beast's seventh head, as the famous Diocletianic quadripartite imperial form of government, I have already spoken in an earlier part of this Letter;² and of its answering, while under that head, to the symbol of the seven-headed Dragon of Apoc. xii.:—a symbolization of it we saw, both in respect of its elevation and of its fall. Quite conclusive, in my judgment, was the very varied evidence there detailed in proof of its being the thing intended in that Apocalyptic figuration: and strong and remarkable seems to me the corroboration of this hence arising, that, when the Roman antichristian Beast under that seventh headship fell overthrown by *Christianity*, and a *Christian Emperor* then succeeded to the government of the great Roman Empire, so abolishing for the time its bestial character (I pray you to mark in contrast the hopeless inconsistency of your own solution on this point)³, that Christian Emperor quitted the old capital of *Rome's seven hills*, and chose another far-distant scene for the site of his Christian capital: the Christian laws and writers of the time, meanwhile, let me add, unconsciously adopting the Apocalyptic figure respecting what had just happened; and speaking of the late overthrown heathen imperial power as a serpent, or dragon, *wounded to death by the sword of civil justice*.⁴—And was that

¹ See pp. 37—45 *suprà*, on your counter-solution, and its gross manifest inconsistencies.

² See p. 97, *suprà*.

³ See pp. 42, 43, *suprà*.

⁴ “*Gladio sternatur*,” said the law of the Christian Emperors of that period respecting heathen rites and practices. Similarly Julius Maternus, a Christian writer of about the middle of the fourth century; “*Amputanda*

wound ever to be healed? The seven-hilled capital lay vacant of any ruling headship there, from the time of Constantine's removing the seat of government to Constantinople, all through what remained of the 4th century, and nearly all through the 5th; till at length, as the 6th was about opening, there began to be heard from the Bishop of Rome of the seven hills a claim, as Peter's successor, and so CHRIST'S VICAR, to be King of kings, and Lord of lords. The claim,—the mighty antichristian claim,—was by the end of the 6th century heard, believed in, bowed down to, by the Romano-Gothic kings of the Western Roman Empire: while, moreover, as the immediate temporal patrimony of St. Peter, the little sovereignty of Rome, and the Campagna round it, was recognised as his right; accordantly with Daniel's figuration of him as also *a little horn*. Then was the Beast's deadly wound healed: then the headship of a mightier sovereignty than any previous attached to the seven hills of Rome; and this as one of the same essentially heathen character as all before.¹—And mark the extraordinary evidence in proof of this explanation from the very *diademic* badge seen on the ten horns of the symbolic Beast, when rising from the sea; with its new 7th head, in place of the old 7th, and those ten horns, signifying the ten kingdoms of Western Roman Christendom, attached to it. For some considerable time the Gothic conquering hordes had still such veneration for the majesty of the Roman Emperor, alike of the Western Empire, so long as he continued at Ravenna, and then of the Romano-

sunt hæc, sacratissimi imperatores, atque delenda, severissimis edictorum vestrorum legibus." And so Baronius, in the spirit and phraseology of Christian writers of the time, "*Idololatriam, ut percussum multis ictibus anguem, caput rursus extollentem, penitus extinguendam curavit Theodosius.*"

¹ "One of the seven"; *εἰς ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά*. See page 46, *suprà*.

Greek at Constantinople, that they looked on the *diadem*, first adopted as the Augustan emblem by Diocletian and his immediate successors,¹ as a badge that could properly belong only to Roman Emperors. But in the course of the 6th century they, one after another, began to realize their own perfect independence and power, and so proudly to adopt it themselves. And now at length, very much as the result of recent researches of numismatists in that department of the numismatic science, I have been enabled to exhibit an illustration of the fact in a Tabular Plate of barbaric coins of nine out of the ten kingdoms of that 6th century, with the Augustan *diademed fillet* (the very Apocalyptic symbol) depicted round the brow of each barbaric monarch.

I pray you, Mr. Dean, after well musing on that new and most corroborative Plate of the diademed coins of the Western Romano-Gothic kings of the 6th century, to consider the consistency alike with itself, with the prophecy, and with historic fact, of this my explanation of the Roman seven-hilled antichristian² empire's prefigured transitional state; a transition begun, as I explain it, with its temporary extinction in that character, on the fall of the primary 7th, or Diocletianic heathen head, and ended by its rising again under the Roman Popes, as a new 7th, or successional 8th head: more especially as contrasted with the astounding inconsistency, in each of these three several points of view,

¹ See p. 97, *suprà*.

² I here use the word *antichristian*, as I have used it once or twice before, in its more general but less proper sense, of *hostile to Christianity*. Though it is abundantly evident that your reading of the "H. A." has been but very superficial, yet you can scarcely have altogether overlooked my somewhat elaborate criticisms in the first volume on the word *Antichrist*: and its proper restriction of meaning either to an opposer *in the specific character of Christ*, in other words a *counter-Christ*, or a self-appointed usurping *vice-Christ*.

of your own.¹ Surely there must here appear to any candid and intelligent inquirer the evidence of truth.—And stronger, far stronger, will that evidence be found, when, looking onward, we observe how every trait of character and acting ascribed in the prophetic sequel to the Beast after revival from his deadly wound, under the new 7th, or successional 8th head, had its counterpart in the character and actings of the Roman Popes, and Popedom, of

¹ In proof it might suffice to refer to what appears on this point in the Schedule of your general Apocalyptic Scheme, given p. 21, *suprà*. But it may perhaps make what I say clearer if I subjoin a tabular sketch, simply by itself, of your declared views of the Beast under its 6th and 7th heads respectively, and its last king.

<p>B. under 6th head = Roman heathen Empire, as in St. John's time; figured in Apoc. xii.</p>	<p>B. under 7th and revived head = Roman empire under profess- edly Christian Emperors (begin- ning with Constantine) and Popes: = B. in its "is not" state, because thus Christian; but yet as B. after healing of his deadly wound: = B. of Apoc. xiii. and xvii. 3, when ridden by the Woman, or Papal Rome; though still partly the old Pagan Roman power: with duration of 42 months = 3½ years (whether literal or mystical), = time of ANTI- CHRIST.</p>	<p>B. under 8th king; (not head):* "The last and worst phase of Beast;" one yet future, but near; (symptoms of its ten destined horns even now appearing;) this being not a head of B., but the B. itself, or Man of Sin, and Daniel's Little Horn, <i>i.e.</i>, ANTICHRIST, "in actual embodiment;"—to appear after Papal Rome's destruction by the ten coming horns.</p> <p>* At pp. 46, 47 I have supposed you to make the Beast in his last phase to be the Beast under his 8th and last head; but mis- takenly. See below.</p>
---	---	---

Thus, under its 7th head, the Beast's "is not" state continues after the Beast's revival and resuscitation, all through the long time of both Roman Christian Emperors and Popes! It begins after Pagan Rome's final fall, yet is itself in part the Pagan Roman empire, as well as in part the pro- fessedly Christian Roman empire: moreover, it has the predicted duration of Antichrist; yet is not Antichrist.

Again, as regards the Beast under its last king, *i.e.*, as Antichrist, it is the Beast, you say, without any of those seven heads which alone apper- tain to that Apocalyptic symbol; being *ἐκ τῶν ἑπτα*, the successor of the seven. (See p. 46.) Thus consequently, according to you, is the Beast now headless!!

If my general readers think it all but incredible that Dean Alford should so have stultified himself, I must beg them to look carefully into the Dean's Commentary on Apoc. xiii. and xvii.; and they will find every single point here stated by me respecting his exposition of the Beast to be simply true.

the ten or twelve centuries following :—remembering only that in all this I intend by the revived Beast not the mere *secular* powers of Western Roman Christendom, as administered on antichristian principles during that period ; but those powers as each and all subordinated to the Pope, and constituting *his* kingdom, as their common and recognised head, the King of kings and Lord of lords, in his usurped and most extraordinary character of CHRIST'S VICAR, and so the VICEGERENT of GOD on the earth. A character this, let me observe, of the Roman Popes and Popedom, as an *antichristian spiritual empire*, which you seem almost wholly to have overlooked, or forgotten.¹ Fulfilled in them, so considered, was most notoriously, as I said, all that is told of the Beast's character and acting in the prophecy. So in regard of the Beast's predicted "blasphemies both against God, and against his tabernacle, even them that tabernacle in it :"—viz., against *God* by the Pope's sitting *as God* in God's temple, or the professing Church ;² substituting his own laws and commandments for God's laws and commandments, and himself and his minion priests and saints for the Lord Jesus Christ, as the source of grace and salvation to poor fallen man :—against *God's heavenly tabernacle*, and *its inhabitants*, by representing himself as the divinely-appointed key-bearer of its door of entrance ; and Papistic devotees, even though unto death not seldom the cruellest, most superstitious, and even perhaps impure of men, as the saints inhabiting it : the Virgin Mary herself, and angels of heaven, being subordinate co-agents with him in his work ; and thus, in fine, God's high and holy place turned into a den of corruption, and of

¹ Let me beg to refer my readers to the Chapter v., Part iv., of my "H. A." on this point.

² In this view of the Apocalyptic *temple* as symbolizing the professing Christian Church, you do not disagree with me. So at p. 654 of your Commentary. On the 2 Thess. ii. prophecy, see pp. 39, 40, *suprà*,

most foul conspiracy against God and Christ.¹ So again in regard of the Beast's predicated persecution of Christ's saints and witnesses : of the Papal fulfilment of which more under my next head. So in regard of the Beast's name and number ; emphatically as we know the Pope, with respect to the language consecrated to his religion, mass-book, laws, church, empire, to have been *Ματθαιος*, (the number of which name is 666,) or the *Latin Man*.² So, once more, in regard of this Beast's predicted 1260 years' term of duration in his supremacy as ANTICHRIST:—the Roman Pope's continuance in power, in the recognised character of *Christ's Vicar* on earth, having been just 1260 years from its primary and imperfect commencement, about A.D. 530, ✓ under Justinian, (as I myself, in common with many other Protestant Apocalyptic expositors, date it,) to the epoch of the deadly blow struck against it about A.D. 1790, at the French Revolution,—a blow from which it has never recovered : and from its second and completer commencing date, A.D. 606, when the adhesion of the Romano-Gothic kings of Western Europe in allegiance to the Pope as Christ's Vicar was perfected, down to the present time, when that adhesion and recognition seems, in all human probability, to be near its end, the term being just but some 4 or 5 years short of the same fated period of the 1260 years.³

¹ I had myself originally explained "the tabernacle of God and them that dwell in it," of God's saints while sojourning on earth, but having their *πολιτευμα*, or citizenship, in heaven. This is altered in my 5th and new Edition to the sense here given ; (see vol. iii. p. 190 :) which is, I doubt not, the correct one.

On the character of Papal canonized saints see my Vol. ii., pp. 12, 13.

² Compare on this my remarks, p. 49. *suprà*.

³ See Note *, p. 41.—How like the late exposure of the Papacy before Europe, in its real character, to Papal Rome's prefigured exposure in Apoc. xvii., shortly before her destruction from heaven, as figured Apoc. xviii. I say her destruction from heaven ; not that desolation of her by the ten kings mentioned Apoc. xvii. 16 ; which I doubt not referred to that of Rome imperial by the Goths, as observed already, p. 44.

As you agree with me in regarding the *second lambskin-clothed Beast* of the Apocalyptic prophecy as, in main part at least, the *Papal sacerdotal power*, or *Priesthood*, agreeably with Christ's own designation of false Christian teachers as wolves in sheep's clothing,¹ there is fortunately but little need for my here dwelling on the evidence of historic fact in proof of the truth of that its application in the "H. A." in the present controversial Letters.—Two points only I must beg to insist on, as very important points of distinction between us. The one is my reprobation and rejection of your strange tacking on of the priesthood of *Pagan* to that of *Papal* Rome, as if conjointly intended in the symbol; albeit that you yourself distinctly make the first and great Beast of Apoc. xiii., to which this lesser one is the declared subordinate, to be the secular powers of *Rome Papal*, subsequently to the *final fall of Roman Heathendom*: though, most inconsistently, flinching from this afterwards; in order evidently to help out your *half* reference of the lambskin-covered Beast, and *whole* reference of the Beast's image, to *Rome Pagan*.²—The other point is, that I carefully define the Papal head to this second lambskin-covered Beast to be the Popes in their *sacerdotal* character as the *Metropolitan Patriarchs* of the Western Church; distinctively from that quite different and infinitely higher character of CHRIST's, and consequently GOD's, VICEGERENT ON EARTH; in which latter they constituted themselves, and were recognised by others, Head of the kings and kingdoms symbolized by the first Beast's horns and body, indeed of all kings and kingdoms of the world.³ The non-perception of this most important distinction, so fully stated and argued out in the "H. A.," has been one main cause, if I mistake not, of the sad confusedness of your Apocalyptic explanations on this great subject.

¹ So Matt. vii. 15.

² Comment., pp. 675, 677.

³ See again on this important point my "H. A.," vol. iii., part iv., ch. v.

—This being laid down, I shall only here further request your own and my other readers' attention to the historical sketch carefully drawn out by me in the "*Horæ Apoc.*," Part IV. Ch. iv., of the successive steps whereby the clergy of the various countries of Western Europe were gradually, after the 6th century, brought more and more into subjection to the Roman Pontiff, or Patriarch, as their head; till at length, as it has been said, ere the lapse of the 8th century, they were all bound, even as one body, to the said Pontiff by a vow of allegiance, obedience, and submission, such as that by which a vassal in the feudal times was bound to his suzerain lord:—also to my sketch of the manner in which, when thus connected with, and subjected to, the Pope, they had it given to each one of them to "exercise all the Beast's power," as "before," *i.e.*, subordinately to him; alike in confession, absolution, excommunication, and even to the making of God in transubstantiation.

It only remains, under this head, to speak of the *Beast's Image* in the prophecy, and my explanation of it as the *General Councils* of Western Papal Christendom. In proof of the truth of this explanation, I have noted not less than five or six points of coincidence,—coincidences striking, peculiar, complete,—between the prefiguration and the thing affirmed to be its fulfilment. 1st, those General Councils, as the *representation* of Papal Christendom, were, according to a common figure of speech, alike in ancient and modern languages, its *Image*:—2d, they were convened by the Pope in his character of Western Patriarch, through the clergy:—3d, when convened, it was the Pope distinctively, and they his clerical vassals, that gave breath to this Image of Papal Christendom, and made it speak; ¹ all *lay*

¹ Strikingly illustrative of this is the description given of the Council of Trent by one of its Episcopal members, and cited by me from P. Paolo:—

representatives being excluded on the voting, as “*vocem non habentes* :”—4th, its dogmas, thus expressed, were required to be bowed down to as the very voice of the Holy Spirit,—his voice as truly as the holy written Scriptures themselves: indeed, yet more so; forasmuch as, when directly contradicting the Holy Scriptures, which was full often the case, it was the Conciliar dogma which was to be obeyed, not God’s written Scriptures:—5th, it was these Councils’ oracular decree that every man, woman, and child should, whether at confirmation or confession, mark themselves, and be marked, as spiritual subjects of the Pope; and that whosoever would not do so, should be barred out from the privileges of the common commerce and intercourse of human life: ¹—indeed, 6thly, that every obstinate rebel against its edicts should be put to death. Against which coincidences of the prophecy and the history, what have you to say? As usual, you pass them over in silence.

I observe, indeed, that you are pleased thus to write:—“Elliott’s view, which would limit the symbol (of the second lambskin-covered Beast) to the Priesthood of the Papacy fails notably in giving a meaning to its acts as here described; viz., the *making an image to the Beast*, and causing men to worship it.” But, as you do not controvert any of the particulars just detailed as the fulfilment

“*Erant episcopi illi conductitii plerique ut utres, quos, ut vocem mittent, inflare necesse est. . . .* Cursitabant Romam nocte dieque veredarii. Omnia quæ dicta consultaque essent quàm celerrimè ad Papam deferrebantur. Illuc responsa, tanquam Delphis aut Dodonâ, expectabantur. Illinc nimirum Spiritus ille Sanctus, quem suis Conciliis præesse jactant, tabularii mantieis inclusus, mittebatur.” Cited, “H. A.,” vol. iv., pp. 213, 214. (4th Ed.)

¹ This is said of the second, or lambskin-covered Beast; whether as done through the Image, or independently. I here suppose it done through the Image.

of that Apocalyptic prefiguration, nor, as I just said, even notice them, your dictum against my explanation is, of course, nothing worth. As to your own counterview of the *image* as literally the image of the old *Roman heathen Emperors*, and, with a view to this, your making the second Beast to be half the Roman *Pagan* priesthood, and only half the *Papal*, it is every way so self-contradictory, that it must really seem I think, as already before hinted,¹ to any man of common intelligence a work of supererogation to refute it.²

III. THE TWO SACKCLOTH-ROBED WITNESSES.

We read in Apoc. xiii. 7, "It was given to the Beast (*i.e.*, as you, like myself, *mainly* explain it, the *Popes*) to make war with *the saints*, and to conquer them;" a statement this which may, in one sense, as you say, be designated as "a wider statement" of the same Beast's war against, and victory over, the *two sackcloth-robed witnesses* spoken of Apoc. xi. 7; the latter being only the bolder and more conspicuous of Christ's saints, who whether individually, or as little communities or churches, bore direct testimony for Christ, during those antichristian times, and at length against Antichrist. But who those Witnesses, and what the Beast's war against them, and their death, resurrection, and ascension, as described in Apoc. xi.? For since, in regard of *the particulars of the war*, the Witness narrative is much the fuller statement, I prefer to take *it* as illustrative of this point in the Beast's history.

Says Dean Alford of it: "Of this no solution at all approaching to a satisfactory one has ever been given. . . . I regard

¹ P. 118.

² You yourself confess to be unable (on your *Pagan* solution of the image symbol) to explain the giving life and speech to the Beast's image. You only here fly from your *Pagan* reference of the image to a *Papal* reference; just as you had before from the *Papal* to the *Pagan*: saying how it brings to one's mind the moving and the winking images of the *Papacy*!!

these Witnesses as still among the things unknown to the Church, and awaiting their elucidation [*being still future*] by the event : ”¹ adding, as for your own part, “ I have no solution to offer.”² Yet, Mr. Dean, with that marvellous spirit of self-contradiction, which is one of the most marked features of your Apocalyptic Commentary, you absolutely shut yourself out from all idea of a still *future* solution. For, after first inclining to think that the two Witnesses are meant to signify *two individual persons* of that character,³ you on the next page incline to think that they symbolize *lines of witnesses* ;⁴ and, a little further on, bind yourself to that latter view of them by making the prophetic period of the 1260 days, which is given as the time of the Witnesses prophesying in sackcloth, (as well as that of the Beast Antichrist’s supremacy, and the faithful Catholic Church’s sojourn in the wilderness,) to be, if not 1260 years, yet a very very long period.⁵ Moreover in your Commentary on Apoc. xiii. 7 you say, as cited p. 121 just above, that the war with the saints, and conquering them, there ascribed to the Papal Beast, is the selfsame, only of larger range, with that spoken of Apoc. xi. 7 as waged by the Beast from the Abyss against Christ’s two sackcloth-

¹ Comment., pp. 653, 655.

² Prolegom., p. 256.

³ So p. 656 : “ This portion of the prophetic description (respecting the witnesses being clothed in sackcloth) strongly favours the *individual* interpretation.” “ One cannot see how bodies of men, who lived like other men, can be said to have prophesied in sackcloth.” Indeed ! I should have thought that in a symbolic prophecy the symbolic dress of mourning and sadness would be the most suitable possible for men constituting the body under the supposed sad circumstances of the witnesses.

⁴ “ The one witness impersonates the law, the other the prophets.” So p. 657, as an inference from the apparent reference to Moses and Elias, in what is said of the witnesses having power to shut heaven, like Elias, so that it shall not rain during their 1260 days of prophecy ; and also, like Moses, to turn waters into blood.

⁵ So p. 670, on Apoc. xii. 14 ; as to the length of the prophetic period in one case, compared with your declaration at p. 655, of the equality in length of all those periods, 42 months, 3½ times, 1260 days. See Note *, p. 41, *suprà*.

robed witnesses: just accordant with which also is your Commentary on Apoc. xi. 7, stating that the Beast from the Abyss which kills the witnesses is the Beast of Apoc. xiii. 1; *i.e.*, the *Papal* Beast.¹

Thus, in spite of all that you affirm to the contrary elsewhere, I consider that I have your own admission in favour of my view of the two Witnesses as figuring lines of witnesses in past time;—in effect, those sons of the faithful Catholic Church who, during her 1260 days' invisibility in the wilderness, were "in various sects," as you say, "and in distant countries, to observe the commandments of God, and keep up the testimony of Jesus Christ:"² and against whom, further, most specially it was that the fallen Dragon, or Satan, was figured as raising up the Roman Beast in its Papal form, as his fittest instrument for their persecution and extermination.

Is there, then, sufficient evidence of there having ever happened (accordantly with the data thus substantially admitted by you) anything in the history of the Popes' notorious wars in past times against such individuals, and little communities, as might be bent on keeping God's commandments and the testimony of Jesus, to answer to the very remarkable Apocalyptic prefiguration of the *death, resurrection, and ascension of the two witnesses*? It is my affirmation, as you know, in the "H. A.," that there did take place what perfectly answered to it, in *the events preceding, accompanying, and following the REFORMATION*.

It is, of course, a necessary premise, that the clause *ὅταν τελεσωσι την μαρτυριαν αυτων*, rendered in our English version, "When they shall have *finished* their testimony," may mean and be construed otherwise thus; "When they shall have *perfected* their testimony." My proof of this meaning of *τελεω* was imperfect and insufficient in the four first editions of my "H. A.," but has been carefully, and,

¹ Comment., pp. 673, 657.

² P. 671.

I contend, satisfactorily, drawn out in the 5th and last edition. To this I must beg to refer you, just giving in the appended note a brief abstract of the critical argument.¹ Thus construing the clause, it was the view propounded by me, as you are aware, that the witness of those witnessing bodies for God's commandments as the rule of life, and for Christ as the only author of grace and salvation, (Apoc. xii. 17,) which were never wholly extinguished, might be said to have come to its climax and perfectness when they discerned and denounced, so as did the Waldenses in the twelfth century, the Roman Papacy and Popes as the great antichristian Apostasy, and Antichrist, of Scripture prophecy,—for herein they hit that which was the very vital point of the great Apostasy: and when moreover, coincidently, they disinterred from their long concealment, and translated and circulated the holy written Scriptures, which was the very sword of the Spirit with which to encounter that Apostasy; and which accordingly became thenceforth with them the standard of truth, ever successfully appealed to in their preaching, and witnessing, and controversies with Papal Rome.—This premised, let me enumerate

¹ As *τελος* (to use the words of Scott and Liddell) “means in its strict signification, not the *ending* of a departed state, but the *arrival* of a complete and perfect one,” so *τελεω* signifies most properly to *bring to such a state of completion and perfectness*. Now in most cases, when a work is thus brought to perfectness, the operation of the working agency ceases; and so to *bring to perfection* becomes synonymous with *to finish*. But not so by any means necessarily when the thing perfected is of such a nature as to admit of, if not to imply, a continuation of the thing perfected; and of *their* acting, with a view to its continuation, who originally perfected it, after its attainment of the state of perfectness. Examples from *classical* authors are given, Vol. ii., p. 417, of the 5th edition of the “H. A.” In like manner by *Eusebius* and *Theodoret* the word is used of the *sin of the Jewish nation being brought to its climax and perfection* by the Jews' crucifixion of Christ; but not so as to imply its then *ending*. The sin, in this its perfected state, was continued by them during the remaining forty years of their respite of judgment, till wrath fell upon them to the utmost; and, indeed, by the Jewish remnant, even to the present day.

the coincidences between the prophecy in Apoc. xi. 7 of what was to follow after this perfecting of the sackcloth-robed witnesses' testimony, and the historic facts in which I affirm the prophecy to have had its fulfilment.—1. The Popes did then, as we all know, make relentless war with the Waldensian witnesses, so as never before : and, as the result of that war against them, and against other witnessing bodies of cognate sentiments and character, gradually more and more prevailed against them ; till at length, at the end of the 15th century, such witnesses and witnessing were all but silenced and exterminated. In illustration of this, the well-known fact is appealed to of the little persecuted Moravian remnant sending two of their members as deputies to East and West to see if there existed any of like mind and doctrine with themselves ; and of the return of the deputies with answer that they found none.—Still was that little remnant themselves the object, during the remainder of the 15th and commencement of the 16th century, of continued persecution ; and it drove them at last into the very caves and holes of the rocks for refuge. Then, in 1514, the memorable 5th Lateran General Council, composed of deputies from all the kings and kingdoms of the West, met at Rome : and, after considerably surveying the whole scene of Western *Christendom*, the chosen Papal orator mounted the pulpit, and said triumphantly, "Jam nemo reclamât, nullus obsistit ;" "There is an end of resistance to the Papal rule ; opposers there exist no more." This was on the 4th of May, 1514. The fact thus celebrated, Mr. Dean, was a *mighty* fact. It is utterly impossible, though you seem inclined to treat it lightly, to overestimate its gravity. Here, then, is my 2nd point of coincidence between the prophecy and the history. The witnessing for Christ against the Papal Antichrist seemed silenced and dead.—And among whom was the pæan of

triumph over the dead raised? It was, as the Apocalypse graphically describes it, amongst deputies from the various peoples, and tribes, and nations, and languages of the Roman earth. Here is a 3rd coincidence.—And where? Says the prophecy, “in the πλατεια, or *forum*, of the great city,” *i.e.*, Babylon; which, taking the city in the sense of Civitas, so as you as well as myself seem inclined to do, must surely be Rome itself. Here is a 4th coincidence.—And what the character of that Roman Civitas and Church? By the members of the Lateran Council it was designated as *Holy Rome*, the very antitype to the type of the *Heavenly Jerusalem*. Of one and another of the sermons of the Orators of the Council this was, in fact, the express subject. But, “*spiritually considered*,” said the prophecy, very pointedly, or as looked on by one taught by the Spirit, it had quite a different character, even as that which combined in itself the characteristics of Babylon, Egypt, Sodom, and the Christ-crucifying Jerusalem. Was there anything to answer to this remarkable point in the history of the times I allude to? It was just then, we know, that Luther was rising up: and, under the teaching of the Holy Spirit, we find him very shortly after, though little conscious how he was therein fulfilling the prophecy before us, in direct contradiction to all his previous most deeply cherished views of Rome as the holy Rome, inveighing against it, and its Church, distinctly, as alike the Apocalyptic Babylon, and Sodom, and Egypt, and the modern Christ-crucifying Jerusalem;—a view of it in which he was followed by all his fellow-Reformers. Here is a 5th and most striking coincidence.—And what was the feeling expressed by the assembled deputies in the Lateran Council towards the witnesses for Christ’s truth, when thus looked on as silenced and dead? They ordered, among other ordinances, that the corpses of any answering to their

character should not receive burial; in similarly exact accordance with that other Apocalyptic statement respecting the treatment of the corpse¹ of Christ's two *representative* sackcloth-robed witnesses by the assembled deputies of Roman Christendom,—that "they would not suffer their dead bodies to be put into a tomb." Here is a 6th coincidence.—To which we have to add, as yet a 7th, their rejoicings on the occasion,—rejoicings enjoined by Pope Leo IX. on "all the faithful" in his Bull for the dissolution of the Council; precisely as in the prophetic description, "And they that dwell on the earth (the *Roman* earth, as before) shall rejoice over them, and send gifts to one another."—"But behold," added the prophecy, "after $3\frac{1}{2}$ days the Spirit of life entered into them, and they stood upon their feet." And, as regards history, it records that on the 31st of October, 1517, just $3\frac{1}{2}$ years after the triumphal pæan of the Lateran orator and Council over the dead witnesses, Luther put up his Theses on the Church of Wittenberg; and the Reformation, and witnessing for Christ's gospel-truth, began again with greater power than ever before. Here is an 8th and most marvellous coincidence!

You exclaim indeed against this last, taking no notice of all the other coincidences; "Elliott's calculation of this period as $3\frac{1}{2}$ years labours under this fatal defect, that, whereas his 3 years, from 5th May, 1514, to 5th May, 1517, are years of 365 days, his half-year from May 5, 1517, to October 31 of the same year, is 180, or half 360 days; *i.e.* wanting $2\frac{1}{2}$ days of the time required according to that reckoning." But excuse my saying, Mr. Dean, that I have now seen quite enough of your use of the term

¹ *πτωμα*, in the singular. So in one of the two cases in which the word is used, Apoc. xi. 7. A peculiarity this in the symbolic phraseology which simply, but strikingly, corroborates my view of the two Apocalyptic witnesses as a collective body, or line.

to convince me that for your word *fatal* (at least as applied to myself) we should, in each case, if under the guidance of common-sense, read *futile*.¹ You agree with me in taking the months of the Apocalyptic prophecy as months of 30 days each; for, like myself, you make 42 months the equivalent of 1260 days, as also of $3\frac{1}{2}$ years:² so that, on your own scale of calculation, 180 days would make just 6 months, and 6 months the 7th part of $3\frac{1}{2}$ years, *i.e.*, *just one half-year*: these years being however, whether on the year-day or day-day scale, *solar* years, of $365\frac{1}{4}$ days each; a point nowhere objected to by you when on that subject.³ Thus, with Alford himself in his *littera scripta* as an assenting party, I have to repeat the exclamation against which you so rashly and self-condemningly animadvert; “Oh, wonderful prophecy! The period is *precisely to a day* that predicted in the Apocalypse. Oh, the depth of the riches of the wisdom and the foreknowledge of God!”

As to the three grand predicted events consequent on the Witnesses’ resurrection, viz., their own elevation to that selfsame heaven of political power and dignity which we saw was the scene, coincidently, of both the Woman’s and the Dragon’s figured position in Apoc. xii.,⁴ the fall of the tenth part of the great Babylonian city, or *civitas*, and of seven chiliads, apparently of the same political city, I see nothing whatsoever in your objections of any weight such as to negative my several historical applications of those three prefigurations:—viz., of the first to the fact of the Protestants’ elevation to high political station and power in Europe,—the very name *Protestants* being the equivalent

¹ *E.g.*, your previous application of the phrase *fatal* objection, p. 74, to my restriction of the grass burnt up under the 1st Trumpet (though unrestricted in the prophecy) to that third of the earth on which the fire that burnt it up was figured as falling! Does not the very necessity of the case so restrict it?

² See p. 41, Note *, *suprà*.

³ See Comment., p. 655.

⁴ See pp. 96, 97, *suprà*.

name of *Witnesses*; ¹ of the second to the fall of Papal England; of the third to the fall of the seven Dutch United Provinces, in their previous character as a smaller constituent part of the Papal Empire.² The weakness of the objections only strengthens my thorough conviction as to the truth of my explanation of the whole prophecy of which I have been speaking.—To all which coincidences there is yet further to be added that, just as the prophecy notices, as the sequel to these great events about the Witnesses, that the second woe, viz. that of the 6th Trumpet, after the fall of the seven chiliads of the great Babylonian civitas, passed away, so in European history it was very shortly after the recognised accomplishment of the emancipation of the seven Dutch United Provinces from Papal thralldom, under their bigoted Spanish oppressors, that the Turkman woe, according to the clear record of history, passed away from Christendom.

And now, having gone through the three grand Apocalyptic subjects of prefiguration connected with the seven-

¹ Your objection is simply the dictum; "Elliott has given it the lamest possible interpretation, viz. the calling up of the Protestants in Germany to political ascendancy and power." Not in Germany only, but in England and Holland also, Mr. Dean. And, let me ask, what historian of repute will you find to support you in referring to these mighty events as if of small consequence; and therefore unworthy of notice in divine prefigurations of the coming future?

² You object that *χιλιαδες* in the New Testament always signifies simply the numeral 1,000. But you know very well that in the Greek Septuagint the use of it is sometimes that which I give it. And what right have you to debar an expositor from illustrating from the Septuagint; especially in the case of the Apocalypse, a peculiar book, as you elsewhere more than once state, (see Comment., p. 676, &c.,) both in its constructions, and its use of words? Because *ζυμη* (*leaven*) is elsewhere in the New Testament always used in a *bad* sense, do you therefore argue (as some have done) that it must have the same *bad* sense in Matt. xiii. 33? Quite the contrary.

You add that the nominative to *εδωκαν δοξαν*, "*they* gave glory to the God of heaven," must be the nearest nominative. But this is again a mere arbitrary dictum. Innumerable are the cases where it is not the proximate, but a less proximate noun, that governs the verb.

headed Beast of the prophecy, and shown how, according to the explanations given of them in the "H. A.," there was that which answered most exactly to the several pre-figurations in the origin, history, character, and actings of the *Popes of Rome*, those usurping *Vicars of Christ*, I might otherwise fitly bring this Letter to a conclusion: save only for the intimation given at its commencement¹ of the corroborative evidence of truth arising out of the very position in the prophecy of the story of Christ's two sackcloth-robed witnesses, and the Beast's successful war against them, as following on the vision of the rainbow-crowned Angel under the latter half of the 6th Trumpet; and the consequent duty that I felt of noticing this ere concluding.—In regard of the whole prophecy in Apoc. xi., including the measuring of the temple enjoined on St. John, and history of the Witnesses given immediately after by the Angel, you thus in one place speak despairingly of your conscious inability to understand it. "I have no solution of my own of the two Witnesses: I recognise the characters, but cannot appropriate them."² In another you say more hopefully; "The prophecy can only be understood as anticipatorily giving in summary, and introducing, the larger prophecy of [the Beast in] Apoc. xiii: " adding that *thus* "its separate parts, so hard to assign [qy. arrange?] on any other view, do at once fall into their places."³ How they *thus* "at once fall into their places," you have, however, omitted to explain to your readers. And I must confess to thinking that for yourself this was a happy forgetfulness: since it must need the cleverness of a very magician to make that to be arrangement which is on the face of the thing gross misarrangement; (for, on your view, what the use, or propriety, of such an anticipatory notice of the Beast?) and that a "summary," or "com-

¹ P. 93, *suprà*.² Prolegom. 256.³ Comment., p. 653.

pendium," which omits almost every point of detail in the subject supposed to be summarized.¹ Very different is the result on the historic view which I have set forth of this most remarkable section of the Apocalyptic prophecy. In the light of that historic explanation "its parts do indeed (like all else that we have before been discussing) *at once fall into their places*." I thank you for your recognition of that test of truth. It will be soon seen whether my explanation does not stand it.

I take for granted that the evidence on which I have expounded the prefigured slaying of the third of men by the horsemen from the Euphrates of the 'Turkmans' overthrow of Constantinople and the Romano-Greek empire, has been shown to be clear and decisive. Thus at Apoc. ix. 20, 21 we find ourselves brought down to the closing half of the 15th century. And, as regards the then undestroyed remainder of the men of Roman Christendom, there prophesied of as not repenting of their idolatries and other sins, there will not I think have been forgotten the remarkable contemporary testimony given to the truth of one part of the charge (applied, so as I apply it, to Western Papal Europe) by himself the terrible Turkman destroyer of the Greek empire;² while both to *its* truth, and that of each and every one of the *other* sins charged on them, the testimony of the Papal history of the times was only too clear, too abundant.³ So, according to both prophecy and history, was that æra in the fortunes of professing Christendom depicted as closing in not only darkly, but almost hopelessly.—But behold just at that point of time, in the pre-figurations of the Apocalypse, a sudden and bright intervention from heaven. The Covenant-Angel was depicted as suddenly descending thence, with the gospel-book

¹ Such details as at pp. 112—120.

² See p. 89, *suprà*.

³ See my Vol. ii., Part ii., ch. i.

(such it afterwards proved to be)¹ opened in his hand, the rainbow of the covenant about his head, and his face beaming as with light of the sun : also, when descended, as planting his feet on both land and sea, just as if to claim them as his own ; with a voice like as of a lion, against some usurper apparently of his rights. Then He entered into colloquy with St. John, bringing him into prominence as an actor on the scene, in a manner quite unprecedented in the Apocalyptic prefigurations ; giving the opened gospel-book into his hands, (after a previous warning voice from heaven, and oath from the Angel as to the determined ending of God's providential mystery under the 7th and next Trumpet,) with the charge, first, that he should revive the prophesying, or preaching, of it before many people, and kings, and languages ; secondly, that he should define or measure the Apocalyptic temple, including all worshippers that made the sacrificial altar of the altar-court the centre of their worship, and excluding others as Gentiles ; then, finally, narrating to him the evidently retrospective history of his two sackcloth-robed witnesses, down to that war of the Beast against them of which a little while since we were speaking, and their consequent death and resurrection.. Whereupon his narrative and intervention ends. The cloud in which he descended reascends apparently ; for no mention of him occurs afterwards ; and, as I conceive, the risen witnesses ascended with it.

So the prophecy. And had not all this its fulfilment,

¹ Being that which in the Christian dispensation is given to each minister of Christ, here represented by St. John, as containing in it the subject-matter of his preaching ; just as that which Ezekiel received, and was charged to eat, &c., was to form the subject of *his* prophesying and preaching. The impossibility of the theory which would regard it as a book containing the subsequent Apocalyptic predictions has been already shown, p. 57, *suprà*.

As regards the Angel being the Covenant-Angel, Christ Jesus, I have also already spoken, p. 71.

just at the time indicated, in the Reformation of the opening of the 16th century; with evidence quite peculiar attesting the truth of the application, alike as regards *the Angel's descent* at the beginning of the vision, and as regards *what is told of St. John* afterwards? Also, (applying your own test) do not "all the parts of the prophecy thus at once fall into their places," as illustrated and fulfilled in the history? Let us see.

1. As regards *the Covenant-Angel's descent* it is surely almost superfluous, when speaking with any intelligent man at all versed in the history of the Reformation, to suggest the general truth and appropriateness of each particular figured point and feature in the Angel's description: as depicting the revelation then prominently made before the world of Christ's own glorious functions and character as the Sun of Righteousness, the author and applier of God's covenant of grace (typified by the rainbow about the Angel's head) to sinful man; and Lord too of this redemption-purchased world: all in contrast with the counter-pretensions in the same characters of the long-established usurper of his place, the great Papal Antichrist.—But, over and above this, was there not in the history of the times, as already hinted, a confirmatory testimony to the truth of this application of the Apocalyptic figuration of quite a peculiar character:—as peculiar, I may say, as that of the Turkman Sultan to the truth of my application of the prophetic verse just preceding? Such indeed there was; and let me state how it came before me. Deeply persuaded of the divine inspiration of this prophecy, when I came to the account in the Apocalyptic vision of the Covenant-Angel's planting his feet so peremptorily on sea and land, with a voice, as if in assertion of his rights, like as when a lion roareth, it seemed to me so obviously to imply that it was against some

usurper of them that he was depicted as then vindicating his rights, which usurper could only be the Papal Antichrist, that I thought it well worth the while to look into the Papal records of the time, and there see whether there might not be just then some more pointed illustration of the antagonism implied than the mere general facts of the Papal usurpation (striking as those were) to which I have just alluded. And what the result of my inquiry? It was, as you know if you have read my book, that precisely at the epoch I suppose to be referred to, on occasion of Leo X.'s accession to the Papacy, and in that magnificent festival at Rome which inaugurated it, there were in some of the pictures and devices on the ares of triumph, &c., along the line of procession, *precise counterparts to these Apocalyptic figurations*; with application, however, to the *Papal Antichrist*, not to *Christ*:—Pope Leo being depicted as having come down from heaven, and planting one foot on the land, one on the sea, as his own; Pope Leo as the rising sun, and with the rainbow of the covenant in association; Pope Leo as a lion, resistlessly roaring against every enemy.¹ Such was the idea of the Papacy, and the rights of the Papacy, entertained at that time, as for centuries previous, throughout Western Christendom; such, just then, the anti-Apocalyptic pictorial figurings of them. And against this came now at length that most remarkable intervention of the Lord Jesus Christ, asserting *His* rights in each of those three characters, through *His* servant Luther, and Luther's associates, (those ministers of true apostolic doctrine and character whom John here represented, as I shall presently observe,) in a voice that resounded like a lion's

¹ I must beg such of my present readers as have not perused the Chapters in the "H.A." (Part iii., ch. iii.) to which I here allude, to do so now, if really interested, according to its importance, in the present controversy. The illustration appears to me really marvellous.

roar all over Christendom, at the great Reformation.—Thus exactly does this part of the prefiguration, thus historically interpreted, fall into its place. And, let me ask, was the illustration of it by allusive contrast just mentioned, so striking and so peculiar, a mere thing of chance? Again, did it deserve, as if nothingworth as a corroboration of my application of the vision to the Reformation, to be passed over by you, if a lover of truth, in perfect silence?

2. Then as regards what follows further *respecting St. John*. Not less than six points are there stated successively respecting what passed from the descended Covenant-Angel to, or before him, which (regarding him in the representative character before stated) had so their counterpart and realization in the actual progress of the Reformation, as to constitute together, when thus historically expounded, nothing less than a compendious history of it:—not, observe, Mr. Dean, a *compendium* in your sense of the word;¹ but one so perfect, and so philosophic, as more than to bear a comparison with any compendious history by the best of its human historians, of the chief successive steps of that mighty religious reformation and revolution.

I say, assuming St. John to bear the character of representative on the great Apocalyptic scene of the line of Christian ministers of really Apostolic doctrine and character, at each epoch successively prefigured:—which is a point of prime importance towards the right rendering of the Apocalypse,² in two at least of its most important figurations. You are aware, I presume, that it was not without various evidence and testimony in support of it that

¹ See p. 130.

² A point hinted at, at p. 50 *suprà*, as one of your omissions which I should notice in a subsequent letter.

I adopted this view. There was noted by me, in proof,¹ the fact of sundry of the Old Testament prophets having acted as *mophthim*, or *figurative representative men*, alike in real life, and when rapt into other scenes in vision; and that this was a character of them recognized alike by Jewish Rabbis and early Christian Fathers: also by some of the earlier patristic expositors, *e.g.*, Tichonius, Primasius, Ambrose Anspert, and the Cæsarean Andreas, as well as by eminent later expositors such as Vitranga and Daubuz, applied in illustration of the Apocalyptic prophecy. Further, it was shown by me that, whereas two particular and most interesting passages in the Apocalypse, viz., that of the sealing and palm-bearing visions in Apoc. vii., and the vision now before us of Apoc. x., xi., are otherwise unsusceptible of explanation agreeable both with their position and their importance, the view of St. John, as bearing the *representative* character of which I have spoken, proves to be a key that at once opens them. Witness the names and acts of *Augustine* and *Luther*. Of this view, however, of St. John, and evidence given by me in support of it, you say not a word. We have only the introductory unsupported dictum by you, that “St. John is in this book the *simple recipient of the Apocalypse*:”² and, as to any satisfactory, probable, or self-consistent explanation of the two visions just cited, in which St. John is brought prominently forward as speaker, hearer, and actor on the public Apocalyptic scene, figuring the Church and the World, you have, as has been already seen, none to offer.

Putting aside, then, Dean Alford and his dictum, and adopting the view of St. John above stated, mark how the successive particulars in the vision had their counterpart in

¹ See especially my Part iii., ch. iv. § 2; beginning p. 112 in the 2d vol. of the “H. A.,” 4th ed.

² Comment., p. 604.

the successive steps of progress in the Reformation.—1st, there was the revelation communicated with power as from heaven to Luther and his associates after him, of CHRIST as the Saviour, the Covenant-Angel, the Sun of Righteousness, the Lord of all: followed, 2dly, (for quite vain seem to me your objections to my explanation,¹) by the discovery, even again as with the power of a direct revelation from heaven, of the Pope of Rome as the predicted usurper, ANTICHRIST; though previously bowed down to with in-

¹ Inferred from vers. 3 and 4: "And when he cried, the seven thunders uttered their own voices. And when the seven thunders had uttered their own voices, I was about to write. And I heard a voice from heaven saying, Seal up what the seven thunders uttered, and write them not." The process of this inference, which I have elaborately drawn out in the "H. A.," is as follows.—1st, the thunders were *vocal*, so as to be intelligible to St. John. 2dly, the voices were called emphatically, *their own voices*, as if in contrast with the angel's voice just spoken. 3dly, the prohibition heard by St. John from heaven, to seal up and not to write what those seven thunders had uttered, when he was about to write, was absolute; and consequently altogether on different grounds, and of a different character, from that charged on Daniel, with reference to a prophecy not to be understood till the latter days, "Seal up *till the time of the end*:" while the reason elsewhere given for his writing what he did write,—viz., as being "the voice of the Spirit," "words true and faithful," "the true sayings of God,"—suggests that these voices, though, as thunders, the pretended voice of God, were not so, but counterfeit, even as if the voice of Antichrist. 4thly, the numeral *seven* confirms this idea; forasmuch as a voice from Rome, as *seven-hilled*, was thence actually called *seven voices*: and 5thly, when the voice was that of Emperor in Rome's heathen days, or (yet more) of the Pope in Rome's Papal days, it was called *thunder*, from the fact of both the one and other assuming the character of Deity. 6thly, the fulfilment of the prophetic passage, so explained, in the history of Luther (here represented by St. John), just at the very commencement of the Reformation, was most exact and striking. After the blessed and glorious revelation of CHRIST to his soul, through understanding of the opened gospel, and when, under impulse from that revelation, he was beginning his contest against Papal Indulgences, the prohibitory thunders from the Vatican sounded forth against him: and he was on the point of acting as well as writing in recognition of them as Christ's own voice, ("Most blessed Father, kill me or make me alive, approve or condemn, for I shall recognize in thy voice that of Christ speaking in thee,") when a suspicion, at first too fearful for him to listen to, more and more forced itself, and soon

tensest reverence, as Christ's own divinely-appointed Vicar and Vicegerent on earth. 3dly, amid the troubles and deadly trials thereupon arising to the Reformers, we next read of their delighted inference from the voice of prophecy, just accordantly with the Apocalyptic Angel's oath,¹ that there wanted but the lapse of what re-

with thorough conviction, on his mind, that the Papal voice was in real truth the voice of the great scripturally-predicted ANTICHRIST. This was the second grand step of progress in the Reformation.

Against all which elaborate argument what say you? Simply and solely as follows:—"It is matter of surprise and grief (*sic!*) to find Elliott interpreting these *seven thunders* of the *Papal anathemas* of the time of the Reformation. Nothing could be more unfortunate; nothing more thoroughly condemnatory of the system which is compelled to have recourse to it (*i.e.* that interpretation). For (merely to insist on one point) if it were so, then the Apostle sealed the utterances in vain; for all know what *those* thunders have uttered. Then the command should have run, 'Seal them till the time of the end,' as in Dan. xii. 4; instead of an absolute command, as here."

Permit me to advise you, Mr. Dean, in future, for your own sake at least, to take care that you read and understand an author before condemning or criticising him. Your whole condemnatory argument rests on the two ideas, taken for granted, 1st, of St. John's bearing no representative character on the Apocalyptic scene, 2dly, of "sealing up and not writing" meaning necessarily *concealing*; *i.e.*, you say, from all others but himself. How alien from the truth are these two ideas, will have been seen from my argument as abstracted in the text above, and given much more fully, of course, in the "II. A." Your objection thus recoils quite harmlessly from me.

As to your idea of concealment from all but John himself, let me beg you to refer to Apoc. i. 2, 3; and your own recognition there of the injunction laid on St. John of writing *all* that he saw and heard, for the benefit of the Churches and faithful generally. How would this consist with your view of these seven thunders as divine utterances, meant for St. John's own understanding, and that of none other of the faithful?—Inconsistently indeed you think that even we may infer something of what was meant; viz. that "the arrows of God's quiver were not yet exhausted," &c.:—a commonplace this of yours, very valuable apparently in your own judgment, as being applicable on all kinds of occasions where you can make out nothing of the meaning of a passage in the prophecy. See pp. 6, 7, &c., *suprà*.

¹ You object, but here not dogmatically, to my rendering *ὅταν μὲλλῃ σαλπίζειν* in verse 7, "at what time soever he may have to sound," as

mained of the 6th Trumpet; and that then, under the 7th Trumpet, God's dark mystery of Providence would be ended, and Christ have his rights fully recognized in the world. 4thly, came the charge as from heaven, heard and acted on by Luther and his brother Reformers, to take the gospel-book; and, after first themselves experimentally digesting it, to publish it abroad, alike by translations into the various languages of Western Europe, and preaching it before its several kings and peoples: and 5thly, their then rising up, as in obedience to the Covenant-Angel's command, (the *ῥαβδος*, or rod of ruling authority, being given them for the purpose,) and defining, as what might alone properly be called true professing Christian Churches, those that in their worship and articles of faith set forth distinctly what the Jewish sacrificial altar and service typified, viz. the Messiah, Christ Jesus, in His two grand characters, of sinful man's full and perfect atoning sacrifice, and His one Mediator and High Priest; excluding those Churches which, instead of this, set forth other sacrifices, another righteousness, other mediators, so as above all did the Romish Church, as excommunicate, and appertaining only to the pseudo-Christian or outer Gentile court.—6thly, and finally, this was followed, just as in the Angel's retrospective narrative of his two sackcloth-robed witnesses, by their having their researches directed to the past Church history; and there in sundry poor and persecuted communities, or Churches, tracing a broken line of witnesses that had testified for Christ's gospel-truth in the previously past dark ages, until apparently exterminated after long long persecutions by the Papal power, or Beast from the abyss; their death

hardly defensible; saying that "*ὅταν* in the New Testament and Septuagint will not bear such an emphatic uncertainty in contingent clauses." But really my sense is so little different from the common that I see no reason to alter it. As *ὁ μελλων ερχεσθαι* is the equivalent of *ὁ ερχομενος* in Matt. xi. 3, 14, so *ὅταν μελλη σαλπίζειν* is the equivalent of *ὅταν σαλπίζει*.

being figured before the Reformers' eyes with all that circumstantiality with which (as we have seen before)¹ the two sackcloth-robed witnesses' death is set forth in the Apocalyptic prophecy.

Consider all this carefully and candidly, Mr. Dean; and then say whether all the parts of this prophecy do not "at once fit into their places," *thus* interpreted?—And consider further whether my whole interpretation of the connected prophetic series of Seals, Trumpets, and Beast is not, consequently, by *the very position* of that which we have just examined into, (a position to yourself so inexplicable,) confirmed and clenched, just as I said it would be at the beginning of this Letter:² indeed, so confirmed as to make the rejection of it nothing less than an act of the most palpable opposition to all evidence and all reason.

I am, dear Mr. Dean,

Yours faithfully,

E. B. ELLIOTT.

¹ See pp. 125 - 128, *suprà*.

² P. 93.

PART III.

CONCLUDING LETTER.

DEAR MR. DEAN,

IT only remains for me, in this concluding Letter, to sum up the particulars of the review given in the preceding Letters of your Apocalyptic exposition and my own; with consideration of the result, 1st, in regard of its bearing on the great question which lies more directly before us, as to whether either, and, if so, which of the two, has the stamp of truth upon it; 2dly, in regard of its bearing on your general Commentary on the Greek Testament.

I. And, as regards the *first* point, am I too sanguine in hoping that even you yourself, after calmly, thoughtfully, and candidly considering the state of the case, will be prepared to join me in giving the verdict against your own Exposition, and in favour of mine? Of course I cannot but be aware of the strength of prejudice and self-love which may be expected to operate with you against such a conclusion. How is it possible that it should be otherwise with one who has not only imagined to himself an interpretation such as yours, but written it; not only written, but published it to the world: and this as an expositor of Scripture of a certain standing and repute; moreover, as a dignitary of the English Church of high position, and raised to that dignity very mainly, it may be supposed, in consequence of that repute. Against this I have only to appeal to your declared *supreme love of Truth*. “Amicus

mihi Egomet; sed magis amica Veritas." And, as you consider the two sides of the case *in that character*, what is the counterview of the one and the other which, as I have shown, must come before you?

Contrast them, 1st, in regard of the *nature and amount of revelation* respecting the coming future set forth as given to St. John in the one scheme and the other: never forgetting that preliminary fact on which I am glad to think we are altogether agreed; viz., that the revelation was a *divinely-planned revelation*; and one, moreover, of which the declared subject-matter was the coming fortunes, as associated together, of the Church and of the world. This premised, and if we divide the prophecy for our passing examination into two parts, you will observe, on taking a retrospective glance at your Apocalyptic Exposition, that it makes the revelations of the *primary* part, including the Seals and the Trumpets, to be really little better than the prophecies of the future that used to appear in Moore's once famous Almanack. If I may trust to my reminiscences of what met my eye in one and another chance number of it that fell in my way in the days of boyhood, this was the kind of prophesying of the coming year by which the said Mr. M. sought, and not unsuccessfully, to take in silly people:—"About this time famine, or scarcity, is to be looked for, more or less severe, followed sooner or later by pestilence":—"War seems looming in the distance":—"Fearful trials now threaten religion; but it passes through them undestroyed, though suffering":—"There are signs in the heavens which forebode evil; eclipses and falling stars; earthquakes and tempests":—"Tidings from the East trouble the minds of men":—and so on. So Moore's Almanack. And what the substance of the prophecies of the Apocalyptic Seals and Trumpets, on your understanding of them? "Wars, famines, and pestilences are to be expected, sometimes more, sometimes

less severe, throughout the coming future; and persecutions, too, of Christians: but Christianity, notwithstanding, still advances successfully. Then, in fine, come eclipses of the sun and moon, and falling stars, and earthquakes, the proximate signs of Christ's coming; but with judgments yet additional to follow: some four on earth, sea, rivers, and heavenly luminaries, in type of life's accessories; some two on life itself; the latter of the two being a judgment from the East."¹—And then, as to all that concerns the Beast in the *second* division of the Apocalyptic prophecy, though purporting in the main to explain it of the Papacy in the first instance, and of some future supposed Antichrist afterwards, yet is your exposition such a medley of confusion, with reference of the same symbol to the Roman heathen power and the Roman Papal power,—or to the Roman Papal power and a supposed future Antichrist,—that, as a prophecy of anything that has yet appeared in the history of the Church and Christendom, it is absolutely worthless.² Whether, then, as regards the primary part of the Apocalypse, or the second, can we believe *this* to have been God's promised and divinely-inspired revelation of the events of the coming future?

On the contrary, on my exposition of the prophecy, there is nothing in the grand mutations and events that have marked the history of the professing Christian Church and Roman world connected with it, from St. John's time down even to the present, that was not prefigured in the Apocalypse. So as regards the very varying fortunes of the Roman heathen empire in the two centuries between St.

¹ See on this my first Letter, and the Alfordian Apocalyptic Schedule, which is given at its conclusion, p. 21.—Let not our Lord's prophecy, Matt. xxiv., be suggested as a parallel. What He there said was not as a professed continuous prophecy of the events of the coming future down to the consummation; but simply a statement of what would *not* be a sign of His immediate second advent.

² See the conclusion of my second Letter, pp. 37—49.

John and Constantine ; and then the great Constantinian revolution, and subsequent irruptions successively of Goths, Saracens, and Turks :—also, as regards the Christian Church, its faithfulness and persecutions in the first instance ; then, on the Empire becoming in profession Christian, its gradual apostasy to a pseudo-Christian heathenism ; and, at length, the development of the Papal Antichrist at Rome as its head. Thus *comprehensive* (as I understand them) are the Apocalyptic prefigurations of the future, considered as a whole ; at the same time that they are so distinct and graphic, *in particular*, and so fitting in each case into their proper *chronological* position, that not one can be applied (with at all the same exactness)¹ to any other historical event, or people, than that to which I have applied it : while, moreover, it is in the highest sense of the word, *i.e.* the Christian sense, *philosophic* ; the causes, as well as results, being set forth ; and these not mere second causes, but the ultimate cause, and reasons for it, in the counsels of God himself. If the evidence only be sufficient to authenticate it, you cannot but acknowledge that this would be indeed a revelation of the future worthy of the Divine Spirit as its inditer ;—as worthy as that which you have imagined is unworthy. So that the only remaining question is as to the sufficiency of the evidence.

And, on this vital point, I must again and again remind you that the grand evidence is that of *coincidences* between the Apocalyptic figurations and the historic facts that they are applied to ;—coincidences, I mean, such as are irrefragable, distinct, peculiar. Now of these I have in the two preceding Letters enumerated not less than some *seventy* or *eighty* :—say twenty-five or thirty for the Seals, twenty for the Trumpets, the remainder for the prophecies connected

¹ In by far the larger number of cases the prophecy is in its details *altogether* inapplicable otherwise than to the subjects and events to which I apply it.

with the Apocalyptic Beast, or Antichrist. I have certainly in this not overstated. Besides which, there is the strong corroborative *internal* evidence of all being thus consistent with itself; all bound together as one in a simple but beautiful arrangement:—the prefigurations being consecutive down to the 7th Trumpet: then, (the *Beast from the Abyss*, that grand subject of Old Testament as well as New Testament prophecy, having been just mentioned under the 6th Trumpet, at a period of time at which its actings were prominent in Christendom, but only cursorily mentioned, so as not to interrupt the continuous progress of the Trumpet prefigurations,) a supplemental series being added with full explanation about that *Beast*, inclusive of the various phases of his existence, from first to last; and afterwards the two series alike converging, to figure the ending of the great mundane Providential drama. I pray you, Mr. Dean, carefully to consider the Apocalyptic Chart prefixed to my Exposition, with its two parallel lines of prophecy, and the multitudinous events in either, all in meet chronological arrangement, in order the better to familiarize yourself with what I say of both its historical and internal evidence: not forgetting, let me add, the comparison of it with the Schedule of your own Apocalyptic Exposition, given chronologically at p. 21 of these Letters; as perhaps the very best means of deepening in your mind the impression that I desire.

And what, then, when you have thus really familiarized yourself with the evidence of truth in the “H. A.”? Of course it will be your part, as *a lover of truth*, to test the accuracy of any of my historic statements, especially of the more striking and important of them, if there appear to you to be any reasonable ground for questioning it; then to see if I fairly deduce from the several Apocalyptic figurations that which I affirm to correspond with the

history.¹ And here it is very possible that a really candid and honest inquirer may now and then hesitate, where for my own part *I* see no reason for hesitation. Strong indeed is my conviction that such cases will be comparatively very few. But, supposing the case to occur, what then is the course to be pursued? To say, "I have found a weak point, or hit a blot;" and so to pronounce against the whole? There have been professed critics that have done this; done it avowedly. But not so, surely, a wise man, or real lover of truth. With such an one it will be a necessity, from his very love of truth, conscientiously to consider the whole evidence together;—the multitudinous points of evidence to which he can see no fair objection, as well as the few to which he thinks he may fairly object:—just as does an English judge, in summing up on an intricate case, involving much circumstantial evidence. Wise and just are the remarks of Bishop Butler on this point. "Objectors may say that the conformity between the prophecies and the event is by accident: but there are many instances in which such conformity itself cannot be denied." And he then speaks of the impression to be derived from the *multitude* of apparent coincidences, in a long series of prophecies, some vast, some minute; and the improbability of their being all accidental. It is on the effect of the *whole*, not on *single* coincidences, he observes, that the argument depends. Bishop Butler is of course speaking of Scripture prophetic evidence generally; not of the particular case of the Apocalyptic prophecy. But his remarks, I may truly say, apply to the evidence of the Apocalyptic prophecy with peculiar force and propriety.

¹ Let me observe, that the usual process with me in the formation of my Apocalyptic views was the reverse of this: my habit having been first to deduce what appeared to me deducible from the prophecy, then to consult and compare the page of history.

Is it too much, Mr. Dean, to hope (let me at any rate indulge myself in so hoping until I hear from yourself to the contrary) that you will both thus appreciate, and thus apply, that learned Prelate's remarks? This done, the result will be necessarily, I think, the entire abandonment of your own Apocalyptic Scheme, and adoption too of mine: not without regret for having so often misrepresented it; and everywhere done it, and the cause of truth in it, so little justice.—Painful no doubt in such case will be the effort. But will it not be appreciated by Him who is himself supremely the Truth, and the lover of truth, especially when followed out at some cost by His servants? Moreover, how else can you effectually undo the evil that may very possibly have resulted in the professing Church from your setting forth of error on this book of divine revelation, and depreciation of what at length you come to recognize as truth? Then, instead of your appearing as an antagonist, and so furnishing to Dr. A. Stanley, and others too, it may be, the occasion of sneeringly alluding to our respective Apocalyptic expositions as if each alike incredible, (a strange collocation, as I have said in the Preface to my new Edition of the *Horæ Apoc.*, of the proofless with that in which proof is almost superabundant,) and so a fresh illustration of the hopeless diversity of Apocalyptic interpretation, and consequent impossibility of any use of this prophecy as an evidence of the *divine origin of Christianity* against our modern sceptics, there would be the satisfaction of our standing on this same platform together, in defence of our most holy faith.—Not indeed that I feel the need of any such support, or alliance. Too fully am I conscious of the strength of my case to have the slightest fear, even were I to stand alone in this confidence in its strength, (which is very very far from the fact,) as to the issue of any the most searching, if only honest and intelligent, investigation into

its truth.¹ And, after the settlement of the question as between our two selves, I shall hope (as I have also said in that same Preface) that Dr. A. Stanley will essay the justification of his rash dictum, and so give me the opportunity of settling the question with him. The real battle, I repeat, must be on the truth of the *coincidences* asserted by me between the prophecy and history: and sure I am that no man can disprove their existence, and consequently overthrow the proof of supernatural foreknowledge that I have argued from them as attaching to the revealer of the prophecy; for none can test them more strictly than I have done myself. And when, on this testing, they are found true, if any man choose to ascribe them to *chance*, it is evident that he might just as well ascribe to chance the many and curious fittings of a steam-engine, or a watch.

II. And now as to the bearing of this Review of your Apocalyptic exposition on

YOUR GENERAL GREEK TESTAMENT COMMENTARY.

Of course the Apocalypse is a Book of the New Testament in many respects quite peculiar, and one of correspondingly peculiar difficulties to the Expositor. So that his failure in expounding it, however total, may arise from defects such as might be comparatively innocuous in his treatment of other of its sacred books. But, in truth, among the causes of failure in your Apocalyptic Exposition there are some which one might feel sure, even prior to examination, must needs have operated unfavourably in

¹ In all future controversy on the truth of my Exposition, let me request that the 5th edition be referred to; as being that on which I have most fully set forth the evidence, and with my most matured views on a few points less correctly stated before.

your dealing with other books of the New Testament. So, more especially, in regard of the precipitation and inconsiderateness too often manifest, as we have seen, in your formation of opinion, and its positive and dogmatic expression, in your Apocalypse :—a precipitation and inconsiderateness of opinion arising in some measure, probably, from undue exhaustion of your time and strength, whether with correct or incorrect results, on small manuscriptal variations and as small grammatical niceties ; and to which may be partially at least ascribed the inaccuracies, inconsistencies, and misrepresentations too, (of myself at least,) in your Commentary : but of the dogmatic and oracular expression of which one cannot but see the origin in an unwarranted and overweening self-confidence.¹ Nor, indeed, (forgive my saying so) does there appear in your Apocalyptic Commentary the presiding influence of that strong common sense which is essential *everywhere* to a dependable exposition of Holy Scripture :—an Anglo-Saxon characteristic this markedly observable in the more eminent of our English expositors, such as Whitby for example ; and as markedly wanting too generally, if I may judge from my limited knowledge of them, (though of course with notable exceptions,)² in German expositors : with which school

¹ Though speaking myself with confidence of the truth of my own Apocalyptic Exposition, I trust that I have not done so overweeningly, in violation of my own implied moral rule of feeling and conduct ; or forgotten Locke's admirable inculcation of the *knowledge of our ignorance*, as one important element in true self-knowledge, and the modesty consequently due to others in the expression of one's opinions. From the first I have felt, and said, that my readers ought to take nothing *on my dictum* ; but referred them to the *evidence* appended *at large*, for their own consideration and judgment. After all that has passed since however, in the way of controversy, I cannot but be conscious that no one has been able to shake the mass of that evidence ; and so feel it to be as on a rock.

² Very specially in the *diplomatic* department of Scripture textual criticism ; in which the names of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf stand out so pre-eminent.

you, in common with other of our English theologians now-a-days, think it well almost exclusively to ally yourself; as if a mark, and indeed requirement, of scholarship. These defects, I say, in your Apocalypse, are such as could not fail, one might be sure even *à priori*, to operate injuriously in your *general* New Testament Commentary:—a presumption fully confirmed by a careful and critical examination of other parts of it. And, under the peculiar circumstances of our Church in the present time, I feel it a duty not to conclude these Letters without a voice of warning on the subject to our theological students, and younger brethren in the ministry; among whom your Greek Testament Exposition is often cited as authority. In proof that I have not thus spoken without reason, and as what is alike due to you and to myself in reference to it, I shall subjoin a brief series of critical remarks that I have noted down on your comments upon St. Mark's Gospel: selecting a Gospel for my remarks as more easy, for the most part, and favourable to the Expositor, than one of the Epistles with its deeper doctrinal difficulties; and Mark's Gospel in particular, as by much the shortest, and consequently most suitable to the limits within which I must confine myself.

In the prosecution of my object it may be well perhaps first to give a distinct and separate notice of your mainly *anti-Petrine theory on the origin of Mark's Gospel*; then a selection from my *more general series of criticisms*; and after them, distinctly and separately also, to observe on your view and treatment of the *chief points of discrepancy in St. Mark* from the corresponding narratives in the three other Gospels.

1. In your Prolegomena you speak of “the universal belief in the ancient Church that St. Mark's Gospel was written under the influence, and almost by the dictation, of

Peter:" but add that all the patristic reports to that effect "must be judged *according to the phenomena presented by the Gospel itself*:"—and that, although "it is possible that some of the narratives in it may have been derived from that Apostle," both "the various mentions, and omissions of mention, of incidents in which that Apostle was directly concerned are such as can in no way be consistently accounted for on the hypothesis of Peter's hand having been directly employed in its compilation," or "of his having exercised any considerable influence over its writing:" seeing that "his own individual remembrances must unavoidably have introduced additions so considerable, as to have given to the Gospel more original matter than it actually possesses."¹ In illustration and proof of this your anti-Petrine (at least *mainly* anti-Petrine) theory, the reader of course looks, agreeably with your own statement of what must be regarded as the decisive testing, for your notices of the internal evidence supporting it in the progress of your Commentary on the Gospel. And he finds the notices on the subject to be in detail as follows.—1. On Mark i. 16, 19, where the calling is narrated of Simon and Andrew, James and John, you observe; "May we not say that this account, so carefully corrected and made accurate, (*i.e.* as compared with St. Matthew's,) even to the omitting of the name (*viz.* that of *Peter* after Simon) which, though generally known, was not yet formally given, came from Peter originally?"²—2. On Mark iii. 16, which mentions Jesus' giving the name Peter to Simon, you say; "This, at all events, does not look like the testimony of Peter."³—3. Mark v. 42, "And immediately the damsel arose

¹ Proleg., pp. 33, 34, 35.

² Why from Peter, rather than from John or James; on your hypothesis of Mark's general independence of Peter in the construction of his Gospel?

³ Why not? Your mode of reasoning seems to me very incomprehen-

and walked.” On this you remark; “The whole account is very probably derived from the testimony of Peter, who was present.”¹—4. On Mark vi. 31—34, describing the pitiable state of the multitudes before Christ’s miraculously feeding them, you say, “Do we not trace here the warm heart of Peter?”²—5. On Mark vi. 50, stating how the disciples feared on seeing Jesus walking on the sea, and His words of comfort to them, “It is I, be not afraid,” you observe; “After this follows (*i.e.* in Matthew xiv. 28) the history respecting Peter’s attempt at walking on the water to Jesus, *which might naturally be omitted* here, if this Gospel were drawn up under his inspection.”³—6. On the omission in Mark viii. 29 of Christ’s praise of and promise to Peter, after his confession, “Thou art the Christ,” &c. (an omission also found in St. Luke,) you say; “No stress must be laid on this as to the (Petrine) character of Mark’s Gospel.”⁴—7. Mark x. 28: “We have left all,” &c. “Here,” you observe, “a saying of Peter is reported, without any distinction indicating that he had a share in the

sible. The omission of the surname Peter, on the first mention of Simon, at a time when it had not in fact been given him by Christ, warrants us, you argue, in ascribing that part of Mark’s narrative to the apostle Peter; while the mention of the giving him the surname, when it *was* given, is “*at all events*” unlike Peter’s testimony.

¹ Why so, on your generally anti-Petrine hypothesis of the origin of Mark’s Gospel? See Note ², p. 151.

² Had not St. John as warm a heart as Peter?

³ Why so? If you mean the omission to have arisen naturally from *Peter’s modesty*, we should remember that the facts of the omitted narrative exhibited Peter’s weakness, as well as primary ardour of faith. Moreover, since it is all but incredible that Peter should not have mentioned this in the unreserved intimacy of his intercourse with St. Mark, that Evangelist had certainly himself no motive of modesty to prevent him from narrating it; especially if he published his Gospel, so as Eusebius says he did, after Peter’s decease.

⁴ If it is to *Peter’s modesty* that you would ascribe certain omissions in Mark’s narrative, on the hypothesis (an hypothesis with which you so strangely play fast and loose) of his inspection of it, this omission, of all others, seems to be the one on which stress might most be laid.

report.”¹—S. Mark xiv. 13. On the narrative here given of Christ’s sending two disciples to obtain a room for the celebration of the Passover, you thus comment: “If this Gospel, as traditionally reported, was drawn up under the superintendence of Peter, we *could hardly have failed* to have had the names of the two disciples given.”²—9. Mark xvi. 7, “Go, tell the disciples, *and Peter*, that he goeth before you into Galilee.” On this we have your remark: “It must not be concluded from this (this specification you mean, I presume, of Peter) that we have a trace of Peter’s hand in the narrative.”³

These, I believe, are all your direct notices of the internal marks of evidence in St. Mark’s Gospel bearing on the question of the measure of Peter’s connexion with it.⁴ And of these it will be seen that, *on your own show-*

¹ What particular “distinction” do you here imagine, such as would have indicated Peter as in part the reporter?

² Why so? I must again ask. Do you mean because of *Peter* having been one of the two, as we read Luke xxii. 8, John being the other? According to your mode of reasoning elsewhere we might have seen in the omission Peter’s modesty, and consequently an argument *in it* for Peter’s supervision of Mark’s narrative. It seems to me probable that here, just as in the case of a similar mission of two disciples told of in Matt. xxi. 1, the names are unmentioned because of the unimportance of any such specification.

³ I must confess that this is just that notice (a notice peculiar to St. Mark) which most of all looks to me like what may have originated from St. Peter himself; especially when taken in connexion with the report of Peter’s denial of Christ, given by Mark as well as the other evangelists.

⁴ You add here and there certain notices of one and another graphic particular in Mark’s descriptions, as indicative of its having been drawn up by an *eye-witness*; meaning, I suppose, St. Peter. So in the account of the woman with the issue of blood, v. 32, “And Jesus *looked round* to see her that had done this.” “Peculiar,” you observe, “to Mark, and indicative of an *eye-witness*.” But how so peculiar to Mark? Matthew, ix. 22, has what seems very similar; “And Jesus *turning, and seeing her*, said, Be of good cheer, daughter,” &c. And indeed both Matthew and Luke are often similarly graphic elsewhere; *e.g.* Matt. xiv. 30, xvi. 23; Luke vi. 10,

ing, and according to your own inferences from them, (groundless indeed, and inconsistent, as my Foot-Notes show those several inferences to have been,) the preponderance of the evidence seems rather to be *in favour* of a *Petrine inspiration*¹ in the main, than against it:—Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, being in its favour, as you state your opinion; Nos. 6, 7, 9 neutral; Nos. 2 and 8 only against. Now in a case of this kind, where the *internal* evidence is thus doubtful, it is the part of wisdom to rest more on the *external* evidence of *historical* testimony. And thus we may with Papias and Eusebius (not inconsistently with its internal phænomena) regard Mark's Gospel as that which incorporated in it probably many of the *απομνηνευματα* orally delivered by Peter to St. Mark; though drawn up as a book, from this and other sources, after Peter's martyrdom:²—a conclusion this somewhat more Petrine than your own. But it is your reasonings on the several items of internal evidence which I have had chiefly in view under this head. And, let me ask, can it be the mind of a true master in Israel that reasons thus loosely and inconclusively; and thinks it well even to print such reasonings in a Scripture Commentary, professedly designed for the use and guidance of theological students?

vii. 14, 44, &c.; though you give them no credit for it. (See Proleg., pp. 38, 39.)

It is rather remarkable (though you yourself take no notice of it) that, in Mark's account of Peter's denial of Christ, he omits all mention of that most remarkable of all such graphic notices of Christ's *looking* on the particular object of His regard; I mean the one recorded in Luke xxii. 61, "And the Lord turned, *and looked on Peter*."

¹ Let me be excused for using this word, as well expressive of my meaning, in its modern French Imperial sense.

² In this case we must suppose Luke's Gospel to have been written before St. Mark's: as St. Luke's Gospel preceded his Book of the Acts; and the latter fixes its own date as soon after the end of St. Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, and consequently before that Apostle's and St. Peter's martyrdoms.

2. Now for a selection from a brief series of *particular criticisms* penned by me when going through your Annotations on St. Mark; and which all tend to confirm the opinion that I have expressed as to the want of due consideration and judgment manifest in your general Commentary.¹

(a.) Mark i. 10: "So Jesus was baptized by John: και, εὐθὺς ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, εἶδεν . . . τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιεραν καταβαίνον εἰς αὐτόν· καὶ φῶνὴ ἐγένετο κ.τ.λ." On this the question arises, Which of the two is meant as having seen this, Christ or John? You say: "It is very improbable that ἀναβαίνων is to be taken *absolutely*, and *John* to be understood before εἶδεν: therefore Mark must be supposed to have taken the *oral* account (whose oral account?) verbatim, and applied it to *Jesus*; αὐτόν meaning *himself*." Now, as regards grammatical considerations, that the participle in the nominative *may* be taken *absolutely* is unquestionable, (though the construction is rare,) and you yourself indeed elsewhere so apply it:² while, on the other hand, the use of αὐτόν for αὐτόν is surely, to say the least, quite as rare and difficult. Balancing these difficulties, there is in favour of *John the Baptist* being meant as the seer the very notable statement in St. John's Gospel, not only of the Baptist as having seen it, but of his seeing it being the subject of Divine promise, even as a sign from heaven that Jesus was indeed the Messiah.³ Besides which, if the dove lighted and rested on Jesus'

¹ In the following criticisms it is the 3d edition of your first volume that I refer to.

² See my notice (*g*) below, of your critical annotation on ἀφ' ὧν καθαρῶν.

³ John i. 33: "And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water said to me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding on him, that same is he who baptizeth with the Holy Spirit. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God."

head, it is difficult to understand how Jesus, humanly speaking, could have seen the dove's alighting and resting there. Your judgment on this point seems to me unsound.

(b.) i. 12. After Christ's 40 days of temptation, you explain the Tempter's at last "*coming to Him*," Matt. iv. 3, as meant in the sense of His "becoming visible and audible." Is Satan's becoming visible and audible to be understood then in Mark iv. 15, "Then *cometh Satan*, and taketh away the seed," &c., and similar passages?

(c.) iv. 29. In the parable of the seed sown, "growing up no one knows how," St. Mark speaks thus of the time of reaping; "*ὅταν παραδῷ ὁ καρπὸς εὐθὺς ἀποσέλλει τὸ δρεπανόν, ὅτι παρесеῖκεν ὁ θερισμός*." "When the fruit is brought forth, immediately he puts in the sickle," &c. On this you refer, as parallels, to Joel iii. 13 and Rev. xiv. 14, 15: references not very consistent; forasmuch as Joel's is plainly a gathering of the *wicked* in God's harvest of judgment, that in Rev. xiv., *according to you*, a gathering of the *good*.¹ For you notice my argument to the contrary, drawn from the fact of the harvest of the earth being there said to be *dried up*, only to set it aside as if with no foundation in truth.² Let me then beg you to compare with this the notice in the text as to the fit time of reaping good grain. So soon as the fruit puts itself forth, *then* is to be the reaping: not, observe, a waiting till the plant be dried up. And, indeed, you have only to consult the farmers on your own Deanery lands on the subject; and you will find that it is while there still remains some sap, and consequently greenness, in the lower part of the stalk, that

¹ See p. 19, *suprà*.

² "The distinction in the passages cited by Mr. Elliott from Bernard, &c., '*magis sicce ad ignem quàm albæ ad messem*,' does not seem really to exist." So in your Apocalyptic Commentary on Apoc. xiv. 15.

they deem the time to have come for putting in the sickle.¹ The question as to the character of "the harvest of the earth" in the Apocalypse is, as you well know, of considerable importance, in reference to the order of events in the coming consummation; and therefore one which you ought specially to have well considered, ere pronouncing in authoritative tone upon it, against another expositor's adverse evidence and argument.

(d.) vi. 21: γενομένης ἡμέρας ευκαιρου, "a convenient day having come, Herod made a feast," &c.: the conveniency of the day being, you explain, "for the purpose of Herodias;" and that it "shows that the dance, &c., had been all *previously* contrived by *her*." But it is surely more natural to refer the conveniency of the day to him who chose it for the feast to his nobles, viz., King Herod: and that Herodias only took advantage of it for her purpose, after it had been thus fixed by him.

(e.) vi. 35. On occasion of Christ's miracle in feeding the 5,000, you assign the nearness of the Passover² as accounting for "such a multitude being on the move." But was the Passover similarly near, and the cause of the gathering of the multitude, on occasion of the feeding of the 4,000, recorded in Matt. xv. 29—39? Rather, in either case, I conceive, we may assign the cause of the gathering to the fame of Jesus; just as you yourself do elsewhere, *e.g.* on Mark viii. 32.

(f.) vii. 4, ξεσων. This, you say, "is a *corruption* of *sextarius*." Rather ξεστης was the regular Greek word for that Roman measure, as will be found on reference to any of the Greek writers on weights and measures, and no

¹ So Thorley's Farmers' Almanac;—"Do not let the corn become *too ripe* before you cut it:" just as of old Virgil, Pliny, Columella; cited by me in the "H. A."

² In John vi. 4 we have this note of time.

corruption of it. Is the French *sou*, properly speaking, a *corruption* of *solidus*? or the English *ounce* of *uncia*?

(g.) vii. 19, εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκπορευεται καθαρίζων (οἱ καθαρίζων) πάντα τὰ βρώματα. On this you observe: “καθαρίζων applies to ἀφεδρῶνα by a construction . . . like that in Soph. Antig., λόγοι δ’ ἐν ἀλλήλοισιν ἐρροθὺν κακοί, φύλαξ ἐλεγχῶν φύλακα:” i.e. taking καθαρίζων as a nominative absolute. And you add: “What is stated is *physically* true. The ἀφεδρῶν is that which by the removal of the part carried off purifies the meat: the portion available for nourishment being in its passage converted into chyle, and the remainder (the καθάρμα) being cast out.” Now ought you not to have here premised what you suppose to be the sense of ἀφεδρῶν; that so your readers might be able to understand, and judge of, the correctness of your statement? Says Mr. Shadwell, in his critical comment on the verse, and I am happy here (and indeed elsewhere also) to avail myself of the criticisms of so acute a Greek scholar: ¹ “*Αφεδρῶν* is a refinement upon *κοπρῶν*; meaning *the place on which the κοπρος falls, ἀπο τῆς ἐδρας.*” And it

¹ I refer to the “New Translation of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, with Notes;” (Walker and Co., Strand) by the late Lancelot Shadwell, Esq., son to the Vice-Chancellor of England of the same name, and formerly Fellow of St. John’s College, Cambridge.

Both the translation and the notes evidence Mr. S.’s acuteness and scholarship; and at the same time his thorough honesty of mind, and profound devotedness of heart and soul to the Lord Jesus Christ, and the glorious Gospel of His salvation. It was a subject of much regret to me (and I ventured often so to express my opinion to him) that qualities so valuable should be tarnished by a spirit almost of acrimony in his criticisms on your Commentary, and indeed yourself; as well as against whatever in the Church of England, and its functionaries, he judged to be antichristian, and opposed to the simplicity of the Gospel of Christ. And I have a melancholy satisfaction in stating, that in a Letter to me, written not very long before his death, he expressed his acquiescence in my judgment on the point referred to; so that, had it pleased God to spare his life, we might probably have had the advantage of his learned and acute criticisms on the New Testament, purified of all bitterness and acrimony.

is not the *αφεδρων*, he proceeds most justly to argue, which purifies all meats eaten by a man; but the *εκβολη*, or *casting out*, of the refuse and excrement. Hence the necessity of taking the reading *καθαριζον* in the neuter, for which there is good MS. authority; the *καθαριζον* having reference to the whole preceding clause, “*it goes out into the αφεδρωνα*”: this, or the separation from the chyle, and *going out* and riddance of the excrementitious part, being the means and mode of leaving the nutritious part pure for man's nourishment.

(*h*) vii. 37. “He hath done all things well.” On this you remark; “This work (viz. of healing the deaf and dumb) was properly and worthily compared with that first one of creation, of which it is said that all was very good.” I see not what reason you have for supposing St. Mark to have meant in his words any such comparison; nor do I believe that he had the slightest thought of it in his mind.

(*i*) ix. 1. On Christ's declaration, “There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the kingdom of God coming with power,” or, as Matthew expresses it, “till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom,” (a declaration followed in all the three Evangelists with an account of the transfiguration as that which occurred a week afterwards,) your comment is as follows. “This declaration refers in its full meaning certainly not to the *transfiguration* which follows, for that could in no sense, except as being a foretaste, (see Peter's own allusion to it, 2 Pet. i. 17, where he evidently treats it as such,) be named [?] the Son of man coming in His kingdom,—besides that the expression, ‘some standing here shall not taste of death till,’ &c., indicates a distant event,—but to the *destruction of Jerusalem*, and *full manifestation of the kingdom of Christ by the annihilation of the Jewish polity*;

which event was a type and earnest of the final coming of Christ.” In which explanation each statement is, I conceive, erroneous ; and your conclusion as to the main point intended, though said to be *certain*, the direct contrary to truth. 1st, Peter does not speak of what occurred at the transfiguration as a *foretaste*, but an *anticipative view*, of Christ’s glory in His coming kingdom. How could that have been a *foretaste* of it to him and his two brother disciples, when they were *oppressed by sleep and fear* during it? 2dly, what is said of their not tasting of death till they had seen the promised manifestation does by no means necessarily indicate a distant event ; but only that the beatific vision, to which death is usually the necessary precursor, should be seen by a favoured few of those around Him before death. Did the divine assurance to Simeon that he should not see death till he had seen the Lord Christ indicate a distant event? 3dly, whereas the destruction of Jerusalem is, if I mistake not, nowhere spoken of as Christ’s coming in His kingdom,¹ (and most inapt truly would be such an application of that catastrophe, above all if spoken of, so as by you, as its *full* manifestation,) St. Peter’s words imply that at the transfiguration there was *an anticipative manifestation of it* ; indeed such an one that the remembrance never left him as an ocular assurance of its certainty. It needs, I think, only to read his words to show this. “We have not followed cunningly-devised fables when we made known to you the

¹ Compare Matt. vi. 10, “May thy kingdom come ;” Luke xxiii. 42, “Lord, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom” : also, in Luke xix. 12, the parable spoken by Christ, on seeing the expectation then rife that the kingdom of God would soon appear :—a parable in which He likened himself to a nobleman who went into a distant country, to receive to himself a kingdom, and then return ; which return, however, was not to occur till long after. Compare too Dan. vii. 13, 14, 27 ;—a fundamental passage on the time, mode, and nature of Messiah’s coming in His kingdom.

power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ; but we were eyewitnesses of his majesty: for he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came that voice to him out of the excellent glory, *This is my beloved Son, &c.* And this voice, coming from heaven, we heard when we were with him in the holy mount." Somewhat similarly Isaiah is said "to have seen Christ's glory," (*i.e.* as inaugurated into His earthly kingdom,) when he saw the *anticipative vision of it* recorded in Isa. vi.¹

(j) ix. 47. "Rather than having one eye, *μονοφθαλμος*, &c." On the parallel passage to this in Matt. xviii. 9 you thus comment; "*Μονοφθαλμος* in classical Greek is *born blind of one eye*: but here it is used for *έτεροφθαλμος*. See Herod. iii. 116." Not so, replies Shadwell. Herodotus, in the passage referred to, speaks of the Arimaspi, not as *born blind of one eye*, but as *born with but one eye*: and so too the Cyclops in Ammonius; which is quite a different thing from being born with two eyes, one of them blind. Again, as to *έτεροφθαλμος*, its meaning is one who having *lost the use* of one eye, sees only with the other. Now this is *not* the case figured by Christ. For He speaks of a man *plucking out* the offending eye, and *casting it from* him: so that he would then *have but one eye*; and consequently be *μονοφθαλμος* in its true classical as well as natural sense, not *έτεροφθαλμος*. We have here in your brief note error on error.

(k) ix. 49, *πυρι αλισθησεται*. On this we have a fearful comment from you. The fire meant is, you say, the fire of God's holiness. The wicked it consumes. In His saints it burns up whatever is impure and sinful. Then you add; "Every offence and scandal must be burnt out of us before we can enter into life." But, if so, which of us all, Mr.

¹ The Lord Messiah there appeared to Isaiah on His throne; and what the throne and kingdom we may infer from the cry of the Seraphim, "The whole earth is full of thy glory."

Dean, with our many frailties and inconsistencies, in temper perhaps, or conversation, such as may constitute an offence to some about us, and here beset us even to the end, can hope to enter into life? Can you? Can I? Or do you look for a purgatorial fire after death, to burn up whatever impurity has not been burnt out here? Thank God, very different is the mode and ground of salvation set forth in the Gospel. See Rom. viii. 1, 34; 1 John ii. 1, 2; &c., &c.

(l) x. 7. Not a word in your notes here, or in those on the parallel passage in Matt. xix. 3, 5, 10, on the use of *ανθρωπος* for the *male* of mankind, distinctively, as if anything objectionable or peculiar; though you make objection to the same view of the word, when so taken by me in Apoc. ix. 7. (See p. 80, *suprà*.)

(m) x. 8. *εσονται εις σαρκα μιαν*. On the parallel and similarly expressed sentence in Matt. xix. 5, (and which is used also by St. Paul in 1 Cor. vi. 16, Eph. v. 31,) you affirm, as from Meyer, “that *ειναι εις* is *not Greek*, but a *Hebraism*.” Are not then such expressions as that in James v. 3, *εις μαρτυριον υμιν εσαι*, good Greek? I must beg altogether to question the correctness of this your grammatical dictum. I do not happen to have by me, as I write, any classical Greek authors, or to have access to them. Else I think I could myself have shown your incorrectness by examples of my own selection. I do however happen to have your favourite grammarian Winer. And from his “New Testament Grammar,” p. 196, I abstract as follows. “Some have erroneously regarded the accusative with *εις*, in the phrase *ειναι* or *γινεσθαι εις τι*, as a Hebraistic circumlocution for the nominative. (Leusden Diale.) The greater part of the passages adduced in support of this alleged Hebraism are either quotations from the Old Testament, or expressions taken from it, and become set forms. (Matt. xix. 5, 1 Cor. vi. 16, Eph. v. 31,

Heb. viii. 10, &c.) Here it has been overlooked that *γενεσθαι εις τι fieri*, i.e. *abire (mutari) in aliquid*. (Acts v. 36, John xvi. 20, Rev. viii. 11) is good Greek (Georgi Vind. 337, Schwartz Comment. 285), and is used, by later authors at least, even in reference to persons." So 1 Cor. iv. 3, *εμοι εις ελαχιστον ειναι*; similar to which is Acts xix. 27, *εις ουδεν λογισθηναι*. Compare *Æsop*. xxiv. 2, *εις μειζονα σοι ωφελειαν εσομαι*.¹ and *Geo. Pachymer*. i. 345, *εις συμμαχους αυτοις γινονται*.

(n) x. 13. You speak of the act of bringing infants to Christ that He should touch them "as seemingly superstitious." But how so? Was not the putting hands on any one the accompaniment, even from patriarchal times, of blessing? And could either the disciples then, or we now, deem the desire of Christ's blessing for our children *superstitious*? As to what you add of the disciples "despising such interruption in their converse on high and important subjects," it is not merely fancy, but improbable fancy. Rather, as in the case of the blind men, told of Matt. xx. 30, 31, and the Syro-Phœnician woman, Matt. xv. 23, they seem to have deemed it troublesome and intrusive.

(o) x. 38. "Can ye drink of the cup of which I drink, or be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" On the parallel passage to this in Matt. xx. 22, you say; "Stier rightly observes that this answer of our Lord con-

¹ Other grammatical laws are from time to time laid down by you, which are either incorrect, or very loosely and inaccurately expressed. *E.g.* on Mark ii. 1; "*εις οικον in doors*, as *εις αγρον to the country*, = *εις τον οικον, εις τον αγρον*: the practice of omitting the articles after a preposition being *universal*." But how universal? Is not the insertion of the article just as common:—*εις την Ναζαρεθ, εις την Καπερναουμ, εις την ερημον*!

Again you at times *seem* to declare against an *uorist* being ever properly taken in a *pluperfect* sense: which, of course, if really meant, would be most untrue.

tains in it the kernel (*sic*) of the doctrine of the Sacraments in the Christian Church." A strange comment by Stier; and stranger still its endorsement, and praise, by Dean Alford. So far as regards *a death to sin* the baptized have a figure of it in Christian baptism by immersion. (So Rom. vi. 4.) But, as regards Christ's peculiar baptism in *persecution, agony, and death on the cross*, Christian baptism generally neither figures, nor supposes it. It was only the apostles and primitive disciples, as also certain witnesses in aftertimes, that were called to imitation of Christ on this point. Again, as to the other Christian sacrament, its kernel (to use Stier's absurd expression) is this;—that I commemorate, in drinking of the wine poured out, Christ's having poured out His blood for me; not that it is a symbol of my having to pour out my blood in His cause. Is it in any other than the above view of the sacraments that you yourself have baptized your children; and that you yourself partake of the wine-cup in the Lord's Supper?

(p) xi. 8. *σῖβαδας*, rendered *branches* in our E. V. On this you say; "The word, by its derivation from *σειβω* (to tread), signifies not merely *branches*, but *branches cut down for the purpose of being littered to walk on.*" But how, specifically, branches cut down to tread on? Rather, says Mr. Shadwell, citing Hesychius, it means primarily, from the sense of pressing down in the verbal root *σειβειν*, a bed made, as was common, of rushes, leaves, and twigs; whence it comes to mean branches full of leaves and twigs, such as a man may lie on. So Sophocles, *σιπτηγε φύλλας, ὡς ἐναυλιζοντι τφ.*—The peculiar propriety of the word, so explained, is very obvious. Branches indiscriminately cut down from trees, and strewed in the way, would necessarily be obstructions in the road. But if mere *σῖβαδες*, leafy twigs, such as were used for beds, they would offer no such obstructiveness.

(q) xi. 32. "If we say John Baptist's mission was from men, *they* feared (εφοβουντο) the people." On this change in the verb to the third person you say from Meyer; "The question is answered *by the Evangelist*, because no one likes openly to ascribe fear to himself." A reason negated by the corresponding narrative in Matt. xxi. 26, where the consciousness of fear is expressed in the first person; "If we say from men, *we* fear (φοβουμεθα) the people."

(r) xii. 4. "Again he sent to them another servant; and him κεφαλαιωσαν, και ητιμησαν." Such is your text, in place of the received text, εκεινον λιθοβολησαντες κεφαλαιωσαν, και απεσειλαν ητιμωμενον. And on it, and your explanation of κεφαλαιωσαν as *struck him on the head*, Mr. Shadwell thus remarks. 1. Dean Alford's reading, though given as the result of his own critical examination, is in fact borrowed from Tischendorf's second edition; who however, in his seventh edition, on maturer consideration, restores the old received text. 2. Though thus in his *text* abandoning the απεσειλαν, yet in his *commentary* Dean A. reasons from it, as if still in the text; "They did not kill him, but sent him away." 3. As to the sense of κεφαλαιω given by Alford, as if the same as κεφαλιζω, herein following Rosenmüller, Schleusner, and others, it seems more than doubtful: seeing that it is a derivative verb from κεφαλαιον; not, as κεφαλιζω, from κεφαλη. And, as κεφαλαιον signifies a crowning or consummating act, the more natural sense of κεφαλαιω should correspondingly be, "they consummated their evil treatment by stoning him, and sending him away dishonoured:" the received text being taken as the best.

(s) xii. 15. On the Herodians' question here, "Shall we pay tribute to Cæsar?" you thus comment, at the parallel passage in Matt. xxii. 17: "The latter clause in Christ's answer, 'Render to God the things that are God's,' reaches

infinitely deeper than the former, ‘Render to Cæsar,’ &c. Man is the coinage, and bears the image of God (Gen. i. 27);—an image not lost by the fall. (Gen. ix. 6, Acts xvii. 29, James iii. 9.) We owe, then, ourselves to God.” A comment very fanciful, as it seems to me, and far-fetched. Yet more, is it scriptural? The passages referred to by you, to show that we have not lost God’s image through the fall, are insufficient, and not to the point; for they speak of man’s *original creation* by God, after His image. Compare, as to the change wrought by the fall, Gen. v. 1, 3; also Col. iii. 10, 1 Cor. xv. 48, 49, &c.

(t) xiii. 4. “Tell us when shall these things be?” On this you refer to your Commentary on the parallel passage in Matthew xxiv.: where, verse 3, after Christ’s saying, “There shall not be left one stone upon another,” &c., and the disciples asking, “When shall these things be, and what the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the *aiōn*?” you remark; “We must be careful not to press the clauses of this questioning too much, so as to make them *bear separate meanings corresponding to the arrangements of our Lord’s discourse.*” For this, however, you give no reason:—what is said of Christ in his mediatorial character, as Son, being uncognizant of the time of the end, not applying. And I cannot but think that the fact of the agreement of the separate clauses of the question with the separate parts of Christ’s answer, (including of course what is given by St. Luke, as well as what is given by Matthew and Mark,) is a sufficient reason for so considering them; and just the most interesting and elucidatory view of Christ’s answer possible:—there being in it, 1st, what should happen before the destruction of the temple, and end of the Jewish dispensation; 2dly, the sequence thereupon of the times of the Gentiles, or times of the Gentile dispensation, during which Jerusalem would be trodden under foot of the

Gentiles; 3dly, the signs at the end of those times, that would precede His second coming to take the kingdom.

(u) xiii. 19, *κτισεως ἣς εκτισε*. “A peculiarity this,” you say, “of Mark’s style, for greater solemnity.” How, if a peculiarity of Mark’s style, it could have been adopted by him with the object of *greater solemnity*, is quite beyond my faculty to understand. But was it such a peculiarity? Comparing John xvii. 26, *ἡ ἀγάπη ἣν ἠγάπησας με*, 1 John v. 16, &c., &c., the contrary will appear. Mr. Shadwell gives examples to show the use of such phrases in the Greek classical writers. It is also an Hebraic mode of speech. So Ezek. xviii. 24, &c.

With similar inconsiderateness and inexactitude you speak, on Mark iv. 3, of “the solemn prefatory word, *ακουετε*, as peculiar to St. Mark.” In proof, however, that it is not so, we have only to look to Matt. xv. 10, “Hear and understand!” *ακουετε και συνιετε*. In Mark it only occurs twice; iv. 3, and vii. 14.

(v) xiii. 26. On the parallel in Matt. xxiv. 30, “Then shall appear (*το σημειον*) the sign of the Son of Man in heaven,” you say; “Manifestly, some sign in the heavens by which all shall know that the Son of Man is at hand: and none, I think, would completely answer the conditions *but that of the cross*,”—meaning thereby, I presume, a *luminous* cross, like that said to have been seen by Constantine. But is not this pure fancy, unsupported by any of the various Scripture prophecies of the events of the consummation?¹ Moreover, if *such* a sign is to be the precursor, how could the actual coming of Christ be so sudden and unexpected, as Christ says it will be?

But, perhaps, on this first part of Christ’s discourse on

¹ How would this suit with the views expressed by you in your Apocalypse, as to the events immediately precursive of Christ’s second coming? See pp. 29—31, *suprà*.

the Mount of Olives, as well as on the next in Matt. xxv., containing the three parables of the ten virgins, the talents, and the sheep and goats, (the two first referring, you say, to the times of the first resurrection and millennial kingdom of Christ, during which all Christians are judged, the third to that of the general judgment of the non-elect *εθνη*;) your views may have changed since you have more thoroughly studied prophecy: agreeably with the notable retractation given at the end of Matt. xxv. in the 3d Edition of your New Testament Commentary; which, as my chief controversy with you has been on the subject of Scripture prophecy, I must not omit. “Having now entered on the *deeper* study of the prophetic portions of the New Testament, I do not by any means feel that full confidence which I once did in the exegesis, quoad prophetic interpretation, here given of the three portions of Matt. xxv. And I much question whether the *thorough* study of Scripture prophecy will not make me more and more distrustful of all human systematizing.” This is dated July, 1855. And, as the *deeper* study of prophetic Scripture had then begun, we may probably presume that “the *thorough* study of it,” which you was then anticipating, would, in your own judgment, have been attained ere completing your Apocalyptic Commentary, five or six years later. But then is *that Commentary* really to be regarded as the result, and expression, of the *thorough* study of prophecy spoken of?

(*v*) xiv. 3, *ναρδον πισικης*. On this you say; “It seems impossible to assign any certain, or even probable, meaning to *πισικης*:” mentioning afterwards, as the two senses of the word given by modern interpreters, (so as in the margin of our English Version,) 1st, that of *genuine, unadulterated*, (as if from *πισος*;) “which sense of the word, however,” you affirm, “does not anywhere else occur;” and, 2dly, that of *potable*, as from *πινω*, which you think the less objection-

able of the two. Better, you conclude, on a point so uncertain, "to leave the word untranslated;" just as it is in Bishop Hall, "narde pistik." On the other hand, Mr. Shadwell, after noting the preposterousness of the sense of *drinkable*,—for why speak of the *μυρον* as drinkable, when not to be drunk, besides that the epithet belongs to *ναρδος*, the *plant*, not to *μυρον*, the *oil* extracted from it, and that *πισος* is the Greek adjective for drinkable, not *πισικος*,—after this, I say, Mr. S. excellently well illustrates the true meaning from Plutarch and Pliny. Says Plutarch (Vit. Pelop.), *ανδρες προς αλληλους φιλικως και πισικως εχοντες*, *i.e.* truthfully or *sincerely*. Says Pliny, N. H. xii. 12, "De folio *nardi* plura dici par est, ut principali in unguentis. Adulteratur et *pseudo-nardo* herbâ; quæ ubique nascitur crassiore atque latiore folio, et colore languido in candidum vergente. *Sincerum* quidem levitate deprehenditur, et colore rufo, odorisque suavitate." So that the *ναρδος πισικη* of Mark and John was the *genuine unadulterated nard*. Further, as to the preciousness (*πολυτελους*) of the ointment from it, Mr. S. further cites the following classical illustrations:—

ὥς ἦδυν το μυρον· πως γαρ ουχι; ναρδινον.—

Menand. Athen., 691.

μυρον τε παρα Περωνος, οὔπερ απεδото

εχθες Μελανωττω, πολυτελους, Αιγυπτιου,

ὦ νυν αλειφει τους ποδας Καλλιστρατου.—Anaxandr., ib. 689.

Παμπολλου δ' επιπρασκετο Αθηνησιν ἡ του μυρου κοτυλη· ὥς μεν Ἰππαρχος φησιν πεντε μνων, ὥς δε Μενανδρος δεκα. So that a *cotyle*, or *half-pint*, of it was valued at 5 or 10 Attic *μναι*, or (as the *μνα* = 3*l.* about of our money) 15*l.* or 30*l.*: a price not unlike that of otto (or *attar*) of roses, some 30 or 40 years ago.

(*x*) Ibid. *συντριψας το αλαβασρον* "having crushed it," you say, "in the hand, and *thus* [*sic*] pouring the ointment

over his head.” On which let me ask, have you ever seen an alabaster vase, such as was used for ointment, and specially for ointment for the dead? Had you seen any you could hardly, I think, have supposed it to have been crushed in a woman’s hand. Besides which, had it been so crushed, its sharp broken bits must needs have mingled with the ointment *thus* poured forth. I have myself dug up many of these alabaster vases in the tombs at Athens; and one of them, very curiously, had the top so cemented to the neck that it seemed like a whole piece of alabaster. I suppose this was done in certain cases, where the ointment was of special value, to preserve it quite fresh. And then a sharp stroke, whether of a hammer or other instrument, would be needed to break it off at the neck of junction: under which operation, if cleverly done, the upper part would come off clean, and no fragments mix with the ointment. Into that, however, which I found no ointment seemed to have been poured previously.

(*y*) xiv. 62, *Εγω ειμι*. On the parallel passage in Matt. xxvi. 64, recording Christ’s answer, “Thou hast said,” *Συ ειπας*, to Caiaphas’ question, “Art thou the Christ?” you thus observe. “By *Συ ειπας* more is implied than by Mark’s *Εγω ειμι*. The *latter* is a *simple* assertion. The *former* refers to the *convictions* and *admissions* of Caiaphas (see John xi. 49): the expression being never used, I believe, unless some reason is latent in, or to be gathered from, the words of the questioner.” The meaning of this is sufficiently obscure: but I suppose you intend the reason of some such consciousness (“a *latent* consciousness,” you rather oddly say, on Matt. xxi. 38.)¹ as in the case of Caiaphas. Was the existence of such a consciousness then in Pilate’s mind, as regarded Christ’s being King of the

¹ Very latent indeed must have been Caiaphas’ consciousness on this point, according to your own explanatory comment on John xi. 49.

Jews, to be inferred from the question and answer, John xviii. 37, "Art thou then a King? Jesus answered, *Thou sayest* ($\Sigma\upsilon \lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$) that I am a King"?—As to your "never," the expression $\Sigma\upsilon \epsilon\iota\pi\alpha\varsigma$ occurs, if I mistake not, only twice in the Gospels, Matt. xxvi. 25, 64 (in the former in reference to *Judas*, the latter to *Caiaphas*), and the $\Sigma\upsilon \lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ once, viz., in the place cited from John.

(2) xvi. 3, 4: "And they said to themselves, Who shall roll away the stone for us from the door of the sepulchre? And looking up they beheld ($\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota$) that it was rolled away: for it was great." On this you say, "Its *greatness* is stated as *a reason why they could see that it was rolled away*." And you add: "To refer this clause back, as the reason why they questioned who should remove the stone, is not only harsh, but inconsistent with the usage of this Gospel." How so does not appear. Though not common, yet you will not deny that cases occur of such a reference back, both in the New Testament and elsewhere. Indeed in Mark iii. 31 you yourself construct the text on the principle of there being such a back reference in the similar conjunction $\sigma\upsilon\nu$.¹ And I must beg to think that common sense will reject so poor and meagre a sense as that which you here affirm;² and make the women's anxious question to refer to the possibility of rolling away the stone;—that reference which you reject.

Thus in above twenty examples taken from your Annotations on St. Mark, (a complete alphabet indeed, we see, numerically,) brief as is the space that these Annota-

¹ $\text{Ερχονται ουν οι αδελφοι αυτου}$. So verse 31. And here, you explain, "there is a *reference back*" to the previous notice of those his relations, verse 21; i.e. ten verses before.

² Mr. Shadwell explains by reference to the verb $\epsilon\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\upsilon\nu$, not $\epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\nu$; it being thence implied that they *gazed with surprise*, because the stone was great. But this seems to me to be neither so natural nor weighty a sense as the other.

tions occupy, I have variously illustrated the truth of what I affirmed of the inconsiderateness, inaccuracy, or, at best, the questionableness, of much in your general New Testament Exposition; alike as regards the meaning assigned by you to Greek words, your statements on Greek grammar, your illustrative references to ancient Greek authors,¹ and explanations of the sense and force of sentences in the sacred text itself. A fault this the less venial, on account of the positive and dogmatic tone in which your opinion on such points is too often laid down.

3. I proceed thirdly, as proposed, to speak of your

¹ See p. 161, *suprà*. Several other exemplifications are given by Mr. Shadwell; as in your citation from Plutarch, noted by him p. 86, that from Polyænus p. 324, from Herodotus p. 368, &c.—One that he instances, not, indeed, from your commentary on Mark, but from that on Acts xx. 13, is too remarkable to pass over without notice. On the mention there of Assos as a landing-place of Paul in his voyage to Jerusalem, you have the note following:—"Ἀσσον. A seaport in Mysia or Troas,—built on a high cliff above the sea, with a descent so precipitous as to have prompted a line of Stratoniceus, the lyric poet (Strabo xiii.):—

Ἀσσον ἰθ', ὥς κεν θάσσον ὀλεθρον πειραθ' ἰκηαι."

Now, on referring to Strabo, we find his words to be, after mention of the steepness and precipitousness of the cliff above the harbour at Assos, ὥς' ἐπ' αὐτῆς οἰκειῶς εἰρεῖσθαι δοκεῖ τοῦ Στρατονικοῦ τοῦ κιθαριτοῦ, Ἀσσον ἰθ', κ. τ. λ. In which passage it will be observed that Stratoniceus is not called a lyric poet, which he was not, (and how, indeed, had such been his literary designation, would he have been likely to have written in hexameters?) but κιθαριτής, a *minstrel*. But the strangest mistake in your reference to Strabo is that you should not at once have recognised old Homer's line in the hexameter cited. (Iliad Z, 143.) It seems that Stratoniceus was a famous wit and punster of his day, as stated in a passage of Machon, preserved by Athenæus; and, in the case cited by Strabo, that Stratoniceus had cleverly punned on the word Ἀσσον in Homer's line. Ἐσσον ἰθ', ὥς κεν θάσσον, &c., said Homer's hero; "Come nearer (Ἀσσον) and be killed." Ἀσσον ἰθ', ὥς κεν θάσσον, &c., said Stratoniceus, punning; "Come to Assos, and be killed."

This instance of mistake impressed itself the more strongly on my mind, as Mr. Shadwell borrowed my own copy of Strabo to show me the citation; when telling me of what I could at first hardly believe, the strange error into which you had here fallen.

treatment of *the discrepancies in this Gospel of St. Mark* from one or other of the other three Gospels.

Alike the *verbal coincidences* often recognizable in the four Gospels, and their *discrepancies of statement* on the same story or subject, offer topics of inquiry of much interest, and more or less difficulty. On the *former* my opinion does not differ from your own, as to the fact of their having mainly arisen from documentary memoranda of Christ's life and history early drawn up from apostolic teaching, early circulated in the infant Church, and known alike to each of the four several Evangelists; though I should wish to state that opinion with certain not unimportant modifications in its expression.¹ It is not however this, but their *discrepancies*, which is now the subject of our inquiry. On these I have to notice the remarks that I find both in your Prolegomena and your Commentary, as made generally and more particularly.

And not a little, I must say, has been my surprise at the union of your boldness of assertion, not infrequently, as to the irreconcilableness of such discrepancies in the

¹ Proleg. 5, 11. To this opinion of there having been early *written* documents about Christ in the first infancy of the Church tends, 1st, the necessity of such from the very nature of things; 2dly, St. Luke's mention of the various *διηγήσεις* which he had consulted; 3dly, the fact of its sufficiently accounting for the phænomena inquired into.—As regards your habit however of conjecturing, and sometimes expressing rather positively the crude conjecture, from what *particular* documentary or other source this and that statement in the Gospels may have originated, I must beg to protest against it, as fanciful and worthless.

Further, as to what you say of the "inconceivableness" of any one Evangelist, if he had the recognised Gospel of another inspired Evangelist before him, altering his diction in parts, in other parts copying more exactly, I must again differ from you. Were you yourself an historian, and, as I believed, a diligent and trustworthy historian, I might probably sometimes adopt your language exactly, if writing on the same subject; at other times condense, or modify, so as might suit my purpose or taste.

several Evangelists, and your inconsistency with yourself, not to add with candour and truth also, in so speaking of them.

In the Prolegomena you strongly express your belief in the *divine supernatural inspiration of the Gospels*:—a belief grounded on their apostolicity of origin, as recognised from the very first by the early Christian Church, distinctively from other so-called but spurious Gospels, (Mark and Luke being now viewed as Peter's and Paul's exponents,¹) and on Christ's formal promise (John xiv. 26) that, after his departure, the Holy Spirit should bring to his apostles' remembrance all that He had said to them,—a promise which implied his teaching and influence over them in the narration of his *doings*, as well as *sayings*;—all coupled with a consideration of the fact of Matthew, John, and Peter's own personal witnessing from its beginning to its end of Christ's ministerial life, which is the main subject of their narratives, of St. Paul's supernatural teaching on these subjects, and of their common access to the most authentic source of information with reference to his previous birth and earlier life.² In all which, you say, (and here I fully agree with you,) there needed not to be any superseding of the individual character, thought, and feeling of each apostle and evangelist respectively: nor, moreover, you add, any negating of the gradual development to their minds of God's purposes;³ a statement this latter which I

¹ So I presume; though the view is not quite consistent with that noted pp. 151—154, *suprà*.

² I have often thought of the wisdom of Divine Providence in ordering that Mary, the mother of our Lord, should have survived (so as her husband appears not to have done, judging from the non-mention of him Matt. xiii. 55, 56, Mark vi. 3, and especially John xix. 26) through the whole time of Christ's ministry, down to its termination in his death, resurrection, and ascension.

³ Proleg., p. 17.

think should have been expressed both more clearly and more cautiously.¹

Now, then, in accordance with this view of their *inspiration*, you first speak of the *discrepancies* of the Evangelists slightly and tenderly, as if on nothing of importance. "In no material point," you say, "do their accounts differ:"—but only "in various little changes of transposition, or omission, from that primitive narrative which had been orally delivered to catechumens, or in fragmentary written documents;" including "variations in diction, or emphasis, such as would be sure to arise in the freedom of individual teaching;" and "those modifications which the individual memory, brooding affectionately and reverently over each word and act of our Lord, would naturally introduce into a narrative, in relating it variously and under different circumstances."² In proceeding, however, to denounce the "orthodox Harmonizers," as you somewhat sneeringly call them, having begun by misrepresentation, as if they supposed "all the Evangelists' own mental powers and faculties to be superseded under the conscious inspiration of the Holy Spirit,"³ you proceed in your *Prolegomena* to show forth discrepancies in the Evangelists very grave, and such as no Harmonizer can truthfully make to agree. "Hardly a single instance is there of parallelism between the Evangelists, where they do not relate the same thing in terms which, literally taken, are *incompatible with each other*."⁴ And, as in the *Prolegomena*, so in the *Commentary*,

¹ When you thus wrote there had not been made the sceptical use of the idea which we have subsequently seen.

² *Proleg.*, pp. 4, 9—11.

³ *Proleg.*, p. 19, Note. Very just is Mr. Forshall's protest against this, at pp. xviii., xix. of the preface to a little work of his, which has just come to hand, as I am bringing the present Letter to its conclusion. It is entitled "The Gospel of St. Mark, arranged in Parts and Sections, by the Rev. I. Forshall, F.R.S."

⁴ *Proleg.*, p. 20.

very frequently afterwards. I proceed to notice some of the chief of these discrepancies, and your remarks upon them. And this I will do, for the most part, in the order of the sacred narrative.

(1) Matt. ii. 22, 23 : “ Joseph, being warned of God, departed into the parts of Galilee, and came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth.” On this you say, (notwithstanding that in ch. xiii. 54, 57, Matthew calls Nazareth JESUS CHRIST’S *πατριδα*, or country,) “ I prefer believing, as most consistent with the fair interpretation of our text, that Matthew was not aware of the events related in Luke i., ii., and how Nazareth had been *before this* the abode of Joseph and Mary, but wrote under the impression that *Bethlehem* was their original place.” But how so? Matthew not aware of the events related in Luke i., ii. ? Of course you include not in this what Luke tells of Jesus Christ’s actual conception and birth of the Virgin Mary ; which is as expressly told of in Matthew as in Luke. As regards the rest let me reply in Alford’s own words. “ Can the divine discrimination have forsaken them in judging of our Lord’s birth and *infancy* ? Some account of these things must have been current in the apostolic circle ; for Mary, the mother of Jesus, survived the Ascension, and would be fully capable of giving undoubted testimony to the facts. Can we conceive that, *with her among them*, the Apostles should have delivered other than a true history of these things ? ” ¹

(2) Luke iv. 14—32. Here is the account of Jesus Christ’s visit to Nazareth, and there reading Isaiah in the synagogue :—a visit which in Luke follows immediately after Christ’s temptation, but which you determinately identify with Jesus’ visit to Nazareth related (as if much later) in Matt. xiii. 54, and Mark vi. 2 ; not with that after his

¹ Proleg. 18.

temptation implied in Matt. iv. 13. And, on the strength of this, you make the following charge on St. Luke, notwithstanding his own affirmation (i. 3) of having endeavoured to give a generally orderly narrative of Christ's life; "Here the chronological order of Luke's history begins to be confused; and the first marks occur of indefiniteness in arrangement, which I believe characterize his Gospel." Three main reasons are given by you for identifying the visit to Nazareth in Luke iv. with that in Matt. xiii, and Mark vi. 1. "That Christ should have been ill-treated, so as in Luke iv. at his *first* visit, and then have marvelled at the Nazarenes' unbelief on a *second* visit, (so as he is said to have done on the occasion told of in Mark vi. 6,) is *utterly impossible*." But why so, considering that so many *more* mighty works had been done by Christ in Capernaum and Galilee at the time of such second visit, if a year or several months later? 2dly you argue, that "before the visit told of in Luke iv. *some* famed mighty works had been done in Capernaum and its neighbourhood, as implied Luke iv. 23." But is it not likely that other miracles followed, after the first done by him at the marriage of Cana, in Capernaum or its immediate neighbourhood, whither John says that he went from Cana for "not many days;" and that then his *primary* visit to Nazareth took place? (See John ii. 1—12.) 3. "That our Lord should have used the same proverbial expression on two occasions is most improbable." So you say here. But what say you in your Proleg., p. 14? "The probability is that Christ repeated most of his important sayings many times over, with more or less variation, to different audiences, though still in the hearing of the same apostolic witnesses. . . . Such various reports of Christ's sayings are most unreasonably treated by certain German critics (*e.g.*, De Wette) as discrepancies." And so too on Mark i. 7,

with reference to Matthew's report of John Baptist's saying, "Whose shoes I am unworthy to *bear*," while the other Evangelists say to *loose*; "John used the two expressions on different occasions, and our witnesses have reported both."—The objections you urge have to be weighed against the counter evidence, not only of the order in which Luke places that visit to Nazareth, but of the fact of the reading of Isaiah lxi. in the synagogue being singularly appropriate to the *opening*, rather than to any *later epoch*, of Christ's ministry; and that both Matthew and Mark, in their accounts of the visit to Nazareth described in Matt. xiii. and Mark vi., make no mention whatever either of that reading of Isaiah by Christ as then occurring, or of the Nazarenes subsequently seeking to throw him over the precipice of the hill on which the city was built. Moreover, he is said in Matthew iv. 13 to have gone to Capernaum from Nazareth after the visit described Matt. iv., just as after that told of in Luke iv. 31; but not so after the visit narrated in Matt. xiii. Perhaps, yet once more, since he is in Luke iv. called *Joseph's* son, just as also in Luke iii. 23, but in Matt. xiii. and Mark vi. *Mary's* son, there may be some reason in the inference thence drawn by certain critics, (*e.g.* Shadwell,) that in the *latter* epoch Joseph would seem to have been dead, not in the *former*. Now is the case one, with such countervailing evidence, to warrant your onslaught on St. Luke for confusedness and misarrangement?

3. Luke iv. 44: "Here the reading *Judæa*, you observe in your 4th Edition, not *Galilee*, "must on any intelligible critical principles be adopted: . . and our narrative is thus brought into *the most startling discrepancy with that of St. Mark*." So you say, though 16 out of 21 uncial MSS. (including A, B,) and out of 200 or 300 in minuscules

all except 20, have *Galilee*: besides that, of the versions, the later Syriac and Coptic alone have *Judæa*; and also the critical texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tischendorf. So observes most justly Mr. Forshall. To which I have to add also, not only that there is the reading of *Galilee* in the three first Editions of Alford himself; but that in his Proleg., p. i., he thus bars himself out (if consistent) from the reading of *Judæa*; “Matthew, Mark, and Luke confine themselves exclusively to the events which took place in *Galilee*, until Christ’s last journey to Jerusalem. *No incident whatever* of His ministry in *Judæa* is related by them.” So too in your comment on Matt. xxi. 12; a comment referred to in that on Mark xi. 15.

4. Comparing Mark v. 2, x. 46, with Matt. viii. 28, xx. 30, we find that the latter speaks of *two* demoniacs that were healed by Christ at Gadara, and *two* blind men afterwards near Jericho; the former of but *one* on either occasion, the blind man specified being Bartimæus:—besides that, in regard of the latter miracle, Matthew and Mark localize it as being done when Christ was going *out of* Jericho; Luke, xviii. 35, as when He was drawing near to Jericho. In reference to the latter discrepancy the Harmonizers (as Gresswell, Neander, &c., after Theophylact,) attempt to reconcile the accounts by supposing two miracles of healing the blind; one as Christ was about to enter Jericho, the other when He was going out of it. But you exclaim (on Luke xviii.) against such harmonizing as “*perfectly monstrous*.” Yet the very names of the Harmonizers that I have cited might have led you, one would have thought, to speak of it with a little less dogmatism and severity of censure: and to remember, and here apply, your own remark in the Proleg. (p. 23,) that from the fact of the Apostles’ divine inspiration “we may be sure that, if

we knew the real process of the transactions themselves, that knowledge would enable us to give an account (a *satisfactory* account evidently) of the diversities of narrative and arrangement which the Gospels now present to us :” (and so too on Matt. xxvi. 69—75 :)—a statement which, if true, would well justify the attempts of the “orthodox harmonizers :” not to speak of your own similar attempts, here and there, at harmonizing ; and rebuke too, on *such* occasions, (as *e.g.* on Mark i. 13) of certain sceptical German critics, like De Wette and Meyer, for representing differences which *you* would thus reconcile as irreconcilable. Is this function of harmonizing, one might ask, to be regarded as your own exclusive prerogative ?

But I hasten on to the discrepancies that are the most important of all ; viz., those involved, or said to be involved, in the varying reports by the four several Evangelists of certain chief circumstances attending the close of Jesus Christ’s life ;—His last passover, His denial by Peter, the time of His crucifixion, the inscription over the cross, His resurrection, and His ascension.

5 and 6. Of these let me at once (though here inverting the order of events) despatch the alleged discrepancies concerning the time of Christ’s crucifixion, and the title over His head on the cross.

5. The former discrepancy arises out of a comparison of St. Mark’s saying that it was at the 3rd hour that He was crucified, or about 9 A.M. ; St. John that it was about the 6th hour, *i.e.* about 12, that He was delivered up by Pilate to the Jews for crucifixion. As you say, “The difficulty is insuperable, *as the text now stands.*” For, as to the different computations of time by St. John, which some (as Wordsworth) have suggested, with a view to its solution, I

think there is no sufficient evidence for it, but the contrary.¹ For myself I have no hesitation in adopting in St. John the various reading, *ην ὥσει ὥρα τρίτη*, instead of *ἐκτη*. For this there is respectable MS. evidence.² And *common sense*, therefore, in my opinion, requires our adopting it on the hypothesis (on which we are both fully agreed) of the thorough trustworthiness of the two Evangelists; not to take the higher ground of their inspiration. And I think it savours not a little of that enslavement to the letter in regard of MS. criticism, (which on other points you so much deprecate,) instead of freedom of spirit, to cramp and martyr yourself, under such circumstances, on the Procrustean bed of rigid critical rule in dealing with manuscriptal readings. Then the *ὥσει* will admit of the time of Pilate's presentation of Jesus to the Jews for crucifixion being after the *second*, and verging towards the *third* hour of the day, — that notable time of the offering of the morning sacrifice of the lamb, which seems in St. John's mind, even more than in that of any other of the Evangelists, to have been a type of Jesus ever cherished, never forgotten; and that of Christ's arrival at Golgotha, to be crucified, three quarters of an hour after, or 9 A.M., just accordantly with St. Mark.

6. As regards the *title*, or *superscription*, over the cross, you specially single it out in your "Prolegomena," p. 20, as an example of the absolute incompatibility of the language of the Evangelists one with another, if literally taken, according to what you call the *verbal-inspiration* theory. "The title was written," you say, "in *Greek*: (*Greek only?*) according to which theory each Evangelist must have recorded the

¹ Compare John xi. 9, "Are there not twelve hours in the day," with Matt. xx. 6, 9, on the twelve day-hours of labouring in the vineyard, &c.

² So Griesbach admits.

exact words of the inscription; not the general sense, but the inscription itself; not a letter less or more. How, then, will the theory here apply? Matthew writes it, *This is Jesus the King of the Jews*; Mark, *The King of the Jews*; Luke, *The King of the Jews this*; John, *Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews.*—To all this I cannot better reply than by abstracting from Forshall's Preface, pp. xiv—xvii. St. John (xix. 20) tells us that the title (τιτλος) was written (not in Greek only, but) in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin. And so too Luke, xxiii. 38; “in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew.” There were thus *three* superscriptions; St. John's apparently being (if we judge from the order in which he mentions them) that in Hebrew; St. Luke's that in Greek; St. Mark's that in Latin. And we may reasonably believe that, while St. Luke has written the Greek inscription (επιγραφη) letter for letter, the Hebrew and Latin have been rendered by John and Mark as closely as the Greek language permitted. As to St. Matthew, he does not profess to give the *inscription*, but only (xxvii. 37) the *αἰτια*, or *ground of Christ's accusation* and condemnation: “They set up over his head his accusation (*αἰτια*) written.” And, forasmuch as the fact of His having been a Nazarene citizen had nothing to do with this, Matthew omits it; incorporating faithfully the rest, “*This is Jesus the King of the Jews.*”

As regards the chief of what remain, viz., the several accounts of the *Passover* and also the *Resurrection*, there is much more of difficulty. And I think that it may be well to premise a notice of your own harmonizing of the Evangelistic reports of *Peter's denial*, before entering on them.

7. At first (as stated, I infer, in your primary Edition) you seem to have viewed the discrepancies on this head of the four reports (of which I subjoin your useful Tabular

Schedule¹) as irreconcilable. And so, you still say, in the 3d Edition of your Book, on the hypothesis of our being

I				
	MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.	JOHN.
	Sitting in the hall <i>without</i> (ἐξω), Peter is charged by a maid-servant with having been with Jesus the Galilaean. He replied, "I know not what thou sayest."	Warming himself in the hall, κατω, below (θερμαινόμενος προς το φως), he is charged, as in Matthew, by a maid, and replied, "I know not what thou sayest." Then Peter went out into the προαυλιον; * and the cock crew (the first, or midnight crow).	A fire being lighted εν μεσω της αυλης, Peter sate with others where the fire was: and a maid, seeing him where he sate by the light, said, "This man was with him." And he denied,— "Woman, I know him not."	Peter is recognised by the portress on being introduced by the other disciple (St. John): "Art not thou also one of this man's disciples?" He saith, "I am not."
	Peter having gone out (or, as he went out), into the porch (* πυλωνα) another maid saw him, and says to the bystanders, "This man also was with Jesus of Nazareth." Peter denies with an oath, "I know not the man."	The same maid, seeing him again, says (to the bystanders), "This man is of them." And Peter denied again.	After a little while another person (ἐτερος, a mate) seeing him, said, "Thou too art of them." Peter said, "Man, I am not."	As Peter stands with the servants, and warms himself by a fire of charcoal, which they had made, they said to him, "Art not thou also of his disciples?" And he denied, and said, "I am not."
	After a little while the bystanders say, "Surely thou too art of them, for thy dialect betrayeth thee." Then Peter began to curse and swear, "I know not the man."	After a little while, the bystanders said to Peter, "Surely (just as in Matthew)thou art a Galilean, and thy speech (ὁμοιαστί) is like that of Galilee." And he began to curse and swear, "I know not the man ye speak of."	After about an hour, another man insisted, saying, "Truly this man was with him, for he is a Galilean." Peter said, "Man, I know not what thou sayest."	One of the slaves of the High Priest, being a kinsman of him whose ear Peter had cut off, said, "Did I not see thee in the garden with him?" Peter denied again.
	And immediately the cock crew. And Peter remembered, &c.; and going out, he wept bitterly.	And a second time the cock crew: and Peter remembered, &c., "Before the cock crew twice, thou shalt thrice deny me." And επι βαλων he wept.	Immediately, while he was yet speaking, the cock crew. And the Lord turned and looked on Peter. And Peter remembered, &c.; and going out, he wept bitterly.	And immediately the cock crew.

* "An Oriental house," you say, in an apposite citation from Robinson, "is usually built round a quadrangular interior court; into which there is a passage, sometimes arched, through the front part of the house, closed next the street by a heavy folding gate, with a small wicket for single persons, kept by a porter. In the Gospel text the intervening court, often paved or flagged, and open to the sky, is the αυλη where the attendants made a fire; and the passage beneath the front of the house, from the street to this court, is the προαυλιον, or πυλων. The place where Jesus stood before the High Priest may have been an open room, or place of audience, on the ground floor in the rear, or on one side, of the court: such rooms open in front, being customary."

forced “to suppose Peter’s denial of Christ to have taken place *thrice*, and *only thrice*.” But, having concluded that there is nothing in the sacred narratives so to bind us, and that there is nothing inconsistent with those narratives in the idea of Peter’s recognition having been made by different persons, of whom however one only may be mentioned, and that the identity *in substance only* of the language of Peter’s denials is all that is required, (not to allude further to the varying statements of the *one* cock-crowing and the *two*, which, as in the Schedule appended, are easily reconciled,) “*all difficulty seems to you to be removed*” from the otherwise apparent discrepancies in the synoptical view of the four different reports.—Now surely this is reasonable. But would not the same principle of reasoning apply to cases like that of the varying reports of two or only one demoniac at Gadara, two or only one blind man healed near Jericho:—as well as to much in cases of apparent discrepancy like those which yet remain for consideration?

8. *Christ’s last Passover.* On the time of Christ’s eating this with His disciples you, when commenting on Matt. xxvi., express your opinion that St. John’s account, which seems to fix the Jews’ passover-day to Friday, the day of the crucifixion, and that of the other three Evangelists, which seems to fix it to the Thursday, is insurmountable. Let me beg, while on this subject, to refer to the two Tables of astronomical calculations by the Astronomer-Royal, Professor Airey, given in a Paper which is printed both in the Appendix to my Warburton Lectures, and in that also of Vol. 3 of my 5th Edition of the “H. A.,” as bearing upon the true *year* of Christ’s crucifixion: in which Paper I have also stated my impression in favour of the *Thursday* pre-sunset evening, on which Christ ate the passover with His disciples, having been the Jews’ regular

passover-day, and consequently the 14th of *Nisan*; agreeably with the concurrent intimations to that effect of the three synoptic Evangelists. But I must confess that, on reconsideration, I am perplexed by what is said in Lev. xxiii. about the date of the unleavened bread great Sabbatical festival, as fixed to the 15th Nisan, the passover being on the 14th: in regard of the *Sabbath* on which, or day of holy convocation, (which might fall of course in different years on *any week-day*,) all four Evangelists concur in fixing it in that particular year to the Saturday, or common weekly Sabbath, following the Friday of the crucifixion. So they call *Friday* the *παρασκευή*, or *προσαββατον*.¹

On the whole, and on this ground, I now incline to think that the Jews' regular passover-day, or 14th Nisan, must have been on the *Friday*, (the day when Christ our passover was sacrificed for us,) agreeably with St. John's report of it: and that thus our Lord must have ante-dated His eating it by a day; perhaps, as you intimate among the offered solutions of the difficulty, in common with certain of the Jews, when the pressure of preparing the paschal lamb was such that it was needed thus to divide the day of celebra-

¹ As regards the day for the passover *proper*, and that for the beginning of the unleavened bread festival, *properly speaking*, we find them thus assigned in Lev. xxiii. 5, 6, to the 14th and the 15th of the first Jewish month Nisan. "In the 14th day of the first month, at even, is the Lord's passover. And on the 15th day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread to the Lord. Seven days ye must eat unleavened bread. In the first day ye shall have an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein."

John, xix. 14, speaks of the *Friday* of Christ's crucifixion as the *παρασκευή του πασχα*; and in verse 31 of the same chapter implies that this *παρασκευή* day was the *προσαββατον*;—*επει παρασκευή ην· ην γαρ μεγάλη ή ήμερα εκείνου του σαββατου*. Similarly says Mark, xv. 42, of the late afternoon of the Friday, *ην παρασκευή, ό ετι προσαββατον*; and Luke, xxiii. 54, of the same afternoon, or evening, *και ήμερα ην παρασκευή, και σαββατον επεφωσκε*.

tion.—Then we have only to suppose that, *δειπνου γενομενου*, the supper-time having come, (so you justly explain the phrase,) Christ first washed the disciples' feet, then partook of the paschal feast with them, Judas included ; then, Judas having gone out, (perhaps, it was thought, to buy things for the unleavened bread feast, for ere the sunset the shops would not be shut,) celebrated the after-feast of the Lord's supper, the Christian passover.¹

9. Further, as regards the various Evangelistic reports of *Christ's resurrection*.

Here,—since you apply to these reports a statement in your Prolegomena, saying that, “were we acquainted with every thing said and done, in its order and exactness, we should doubtless be able to reconcile the present forms of the narratives,” although, this key being wanting, all attempts to harmonize them must be futile,—I might perhaps have passed over all notice of the subject ; were it not that elsewhere you charge the harmonists with disingenuousness (“probably unconscious disingenuousness”) in attempting their reconciliation. I shall therefore take the liberty of showing, as I trust, that it may be made with little more of “arbitrary assumptions” than you yourself have made in your harmonizing Schedule of the four several reports of Peter's denial of Christ.

The women from Galilee having, at the close of the Friday afternoon, *before sunset*, and therefore before the commencement of the great Sabbath, bought spices, then rested the

¹ Let me observe here that it is quite incredible that St. John should not have seen the other three Gospels, so as you suggest ; considering the perpetual intercourse of the several parts of the early Christian Church one with the other. And hence the rather our inference that St. John did not see a discrepancy between his report of the passover-day, and that of the other Evangelists ; whether to be reconciled from admitted Jewish irregularities, such as I have suggested, or otherwise.

Sabbath according to commandment, (Luke,) but on its evening, *after sunset*,¹ bought in addition what might still be needed for their purpose, prepared for their work of love to the corpse of their departed Lord on the morrow.

Now, in regard of what then was to happen, it may be well to premise, 1st, that the disciples for the most part seem to have had separate lodgings in Jerusalem, at least the women separate from the apostles;² 2dly, that, Jerusalem being a great city, the distance of the lodgings might probably be such as that paths from Calvary, outside the city, to the one part of it and to the other would immediately diverge; 3dly, that, Jerusalem being all rocky, these narrow paths would almost certainly, just as in its immediate neighbourhood now, have stone walls on either side; so that what might pass in the one pathway would very soon be on a spot hidden from the other.

This premised, we take up the Evangelistic story; and have to suppose that the Galilean women, including Mary Magdalen, having planned to start at the early dawn of the Sunday, Mary Magdalen in her zeal and love anticipated the other women, starting while it was yet dark (John); and, on finding when arrived at the tomb that the stone was rolled away, hastened by a different path to Peter and John's lodgings to tell them. While she is on the road thither, or rather when arrived there, the other women come to the tomb, the sun having just risen (Mark), which, ten or twelve days after the vernal equinox, might be

¹ You oddly call this variety in the reports of the time of buying the spices "a slight but valuable discrepancy, as showing the independence of the accounts." Surely there is nothing whatever of improbability in the way in which I have harmonized them.

² Compare John xix. 27, "From that hour that disciple took her (*εις τα ιδια*) to his own home"; John xvi. 32, "Ye shall be scattered every one (*εις τα ιδια*) to his own home"; and John xx. 10, *Απηλθον προς εαυτους οι μαθηται*, "the (two) disciples (Peter and John) went away to their own home."

about twenty minutes before six;¹ and see an Angel sitting on the stone, by the right of the tomb, who tells them Jesus Christ is risen, and charges them so to tell the disciples. They run affrighted, yet hopeful; telling no one *by the way* that they might meet. Then, by another path, come up John and Peter, Mary Magdalen following. The two former look into the tomb, see it empty, and depart, leaving there Mary Magdalen, to whom Christ then first of all manifests Himself: the purport of His reply to her, when about to touch and worship Him, being (as I think) to the effect; "Stop not now for this; I am not yet ascended, nor immediately about to ascend, to heaven. Other opportunities of intercourse ere then will be afforded. But go, tell the disciples." He vanishes; then immediately afterwards reveals Himself to *one party* of the other women that have separated on their various homeward routes in returning; and, in His sovereignty, permits them to hold His feet and worship Him.

All else is comparatively plain. The women that have first arrived, and who have only seen the Angel, go about, and tell one and another of the disciples scattered in Jerusalem. Two of these, apparently still early in the day, start for Emmaus; and, having been detained, by stopping perhaps at a friend's on the road, resume their journey in the afternoon. Then followed the meeting with Jesus; their statement of what they had heard from the women of an Angel's appearance at the tomb, and declaration that He was risen:—His revelation of Himself to them in the breaking of bread, and then vanishing; their return forthwith to Jerusalem; and, on finding that the apostles and disciples had gathered together, going to them with their report; and hearing from them that not only had He

¹ See Professor Airey's Tables, already alluded to, pretty much fixing the day of Christ's resurrection to the 5th April, A.D. 33.

been seen by the women, but at some time in the day by *Peter*.

Such is my idea of the way in which we may fairly harmonize the four Evangelists' several accounts. And, in doing so, if there are assumptions to be made that may seem arbitrary, and an undue exercise of imagination in filling up certain hiatus' in the narrative with probabilities, it is that which has sometimes to be done, and may be most truly done, in circumstantial narratives of occurrences in common life. If the impression still remain of the case as intricate, and of the solution as involving improbabilities, let it never be forgotten that in various important events described in His revealed Word, and most especially in this, it pleases God to do that which otherwise characterizes His dealings in Providence; viz., *purposely to leave difficulties*, in order to try the faith of men. So the dishonest sceptic grounds his unbelief on the consideration simply of the *difficulties*. But the honest inquirer (like an English judge in difficult and intricate cases) fairly considers *the whole evidence*: and, looking to the immensity, variety, and consistency of the evidence for the truth of revelation, rests his belief on it (notwithstanding certain difficulties that he cannot resolve) as on a rock.

10. Once more, as to the *ascension*, I have only to observe that though St. Mark in that part of ch. xvi. of his Gospel which is alone *undoubtedly* his,¹ and St. John in the conclusion of his Gospel, give no account of Christ's ascension, they do yet both the one and the other imply it. So Mark xii. 36, 37; (compare Acts ii. 32, 35;) John vi. 62, xx. 17; &c.

Thus in fine, Mr. Dean, I have shown on what I think

¹ May not the addition of the remaining verses in Mark xvi. have been the addition made by himself (so as was the custom then, even as now) on a later edition of a book?

abundantly sufficient evidence that the inconsiderateness and inconsistencies which so strikingly characterize your Apocalyptic Commentary are in no little measure characteristic also of your general Commentary on the Greek Testament. Alike we have observed them in your general theories about that Gospel of St. Mark which I have made the subject of my more special investigation, in your particular criticisms, and in your treatment of its more prominent difficulties as compared with the other Gospels.

Now, as regards the Gospels at least, I cannot but think that this evident want of due consideration in the Scriptural Comments is partly attributable to the too large measure of time and thought which must have been absorbed in the preparation of the Table of various Manuscriptal and Patristic readings which forms so conspicuous a feature on every page of your Gospel Commentary. In chap. vi. of your general Prolegomena,¹ you propose "to set before the student the principles on which the sacred text has been revived by you:" and, after measured praise of Lachmann's recension, and still more of that of the second edition of Tischendorf, coupled, however, with a discriminative notice of the "miserable meagreness" of its digest in the earlier Gospels, and its other imperfections,² you speak of your own Tabular Digest as one combining the various readings both of those two critics and of Scholz, and which, indeed, you have endeavoured to make "as complete as possible:"³ at the same time intimating that *your own judgment has been everywhere carefully exercised*, in order to educe out of the lists of all three the best and most reliable text.⁴ Now in St. Mark, for example, so copious is the list thus given by you (given, as you profess,

¹ P. 72.² Pp. 74—78.³ P. 79.

⁴ At p. 77 you speak of "having worked through the whole of Tischendorf's text in constructing your own;" that "your aim has been, in every case, to endeavour to mount up to the original reading;—that reading which may be supposed to have given rise to the variations:" and so on.

after critical examination,) as I think more than to equal, in regard of the quantity of letter-press, both that of the text and that of the annotations on it put together. I subjoin a specimen.¹ From this it will be seen that in the first five lines of the Table of various readings on this Gospel there are references to 67 different MSS. and Versions; all of course to be compared together, and adjudicated on, by him who would *carefully* and *independently* construct his text (so as you profess to have done) out of them. And, supposing some three minutes only to be given to the consideration of each on an average, (and I think the smaller time required for many would be so counterbalanced by the greater time required for others,

¹ Chap. i. 1. *υι. θ. om.* 28. 255 Iren. gr. Orig₃ Jer₃ : ins A B D, &c. Iren₂ (expr₁) Jer₁.—*rec. του θ.*, with A, &c. : txt BDL 102.—2. *καθως* BKLΔ 4. 20¹. 33. 209—55 Orig₃ : txt A D P, &c.—*rec. εν τοις προφηταις* (corr_n, the cit. being from Mal. and Isa.), with A P æth. sl arr Chr Phot Iren-lat₂, &c. : *εν τω προφητη* al₁ : om tol¹ : al vary : txt (τω bef ησ. om D al) BDL 1. 22. 33 al₁₆ it v Syr syr-jer perss ar-erp copt goth syr-marg Ir-gr-lat.

In your brief critical notice of Griesbach, Proleg., p. 73 you observe that “the number and complexity of his symbols, indicating his judgment on the quality of the readings, form an objection to his Edition as furnishing a text for general use.” Did you forget, when thus writing, the complexity apparent in your own digest; such as it must appear to the theological student, and young hard-worked clergyman, to whom you recommend “the diligent study of the various readings indicated in it, as of the first moment”?

I must not forget, too, your marginal references, and which must necessarily have occupied time. In your Prolegom., pp. 80, 81, you say that they are references “to verbal and idiomatic usages”; and “that you have inserted not one which has not been verified.” Unfortunately the very first which I happened to look for, viz. that in Mark ix. 11, on “Elias coming first,” &c., turned out to be a non-existent verse, Acts xii. 32; that chapter having only twenty-five verses: and, as for the only other reference, viz. Dan. ii. 28, (“There is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets,” &c.) what it has to do with any verbal or idiomatic usage here, I am at a loss to understand.

I was wishing to see if your *references* threw any light on a real difficulty in the sacred text, viz. about “Elias coming, and *restoring all things* :”—I say a real difficulty; since Christ himself is He who is to make all things new, and bring in the wished for *αποκαταστας*. But not a word is there to explain this, or even of allusion to it, either in your notes or references.

involving points of more special difficulty, as to constitute this a perhaps fair average), then for the due consideration of the items in these five lines, 3×67 , or about 200 minutes, would be necessary; *i.e.* $3\frac{1}{2}$ hours. And, as St. Mark's Gospel occupies in your Work from p. 284 to p. 396, or 112 pages, with some 20 of these lines on each, as about the average, there would be needed $\frac{2240}{5} \times 3\frac{1}{2}$ as

the number of hours needed for the due consideration simply of these various readings, *i.e.* near 1,600 hours. And, supposing you to have been able to devote 5 hours a-day continuously to your Work on the New Testament, which, considering your various ministerial and other avocations, must be admitted to be a large allowance for it, then a whole year must have been occupied simply on the various readings in the one Gospel of St. Mark, with its 112 pages; and, on the same scale, for the whole first volume of 834 pages on the Gospels, some 7 years:¹ not to add what would be needed for the important subjects of the Prolegomena. Now, then, who does not see how this must have cramped you for time in the deliberate and mature consideration requisite in the yet more important department of the elucidation of the sacred Scripture itself! Probably there has been a mutual injury from the interference of these different departments of literary labour, one with another. And thus it is, as you doubtless know, that Tischendorf, the highest existing authority on that subject, has spoken so depreciatingly and severely (I think indeed too severely) of your work, in respect of this parti-

¹ I do not thus speak without having paid some little attention to the "science diplomatique;" and had experience of the time requisite for the noting, and the comparison of, various readings in different MSS. of Holy Scripture. Among other MSS., I have had the good fortune of inspecting and examining for some hours both the famous Vatican MS. and the Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus:—the latter at Paris; the former, through the courtesy of Cardinal Mai, at Rome.

cular department of your literary labours.¹ I cannot but think that you erred in judgment in attempting (however noble the undertaking, if with strength sufficient for its due accomplishment,) to combine the two objects of an *independent recension of the text*, as the result of your own critical investigation of the various readings, and the elucidation of its sense and the lessons involved in it; and that it would have been better to have given your strength time and thought, separately and less ambitiously, to the one department or the other:—if to the *latter*, professedly adopting Tischendorf's text, except on the few occasions on which you felt bound to differ from him. In such case you would have had both space and time for more fully considering and stating the grounds of difference on that head; and also been able to throw your almost undivided strength into the grander department of the elucidation, and vindication from objectors, of Holy Scripture.

In the foregoing criticisms I have made one of the Gospels only in your Commentary the subject of my investigation. But the same defects might be easily shown to characterize your Annotations on the Epistles. A specimen or two have already appeared in my

¹ “Quod rem textûs sacri criticam attinet Alfordius tam parum studii, judicii, religionisque probavit, ut vix in scholarum usum scripsisse censendus sit.” Moreover he adds the charge of *bad faith* against you:—“Editionem meam recentissimam omni modo, neque vero sine malâ fide, suam in rem convertit.” A charge this made in 1850; and to which it astonishes me that you should have made neither answer, nor allusion, in your 3d edition of the 1st vol. in 1856.

Mr. Shadwell, who cites this both in his Preface, and at p. 413 of his Notes on Mark's Gospel, specifies also some five or six places in St. Mark's Gospel in which you have followed the emendation from the received text given in Tischendorf's 2d edition, as if, however, on your own judgment; but in which Tischendorf in his 7th edition has, on more mature consideration, returned to the *textus receptus*: viz. on Mark vii. 32, viii. 1, xii. 4, xvi. 39, and a few others.

strictures on your Apocalypse.¹ They are stamped on the face of every Section alike of your Book.

But why is it that I have thus included in my unfavourable criticisms your general Commentary; as well as that on the Apocalypse, the examination of which was forced on me by your strictures on my *Horæ Apocalypticæ*? From any uncalled-for and unkind desire of depreciating it? By no means. Much more gratifying would it have been to me, could I have done so with truth, to notice eulogistically the elaborate work of the son of my old and valued friend, your father; a son of whose early poetic promise I used in olden times to have pleasure in speaking to him, and whose subsequent successive steps to distinction I have marked with friendly interest.—But higher considerations enjoin on me a tone other than eulogistic. I have had occasion again and again to hear your Commentary referred to as an authority on points on which I doubted not its erroneousness, by younger brethren in the ministry. For example, in my own pulpit at Brighton a valued young friend, in commenting on 2 Thess. ii. 2, spoke of the *εὐεσηκεν* there, which our received version renders (quite rightly, I doubt not,) “the day of Christ is *at hand*,” as determined by “modern criticism” to mean “the day of Christ is *actually present*.”² On which, having asked him for his authority for that piece of modern criticism, and learned that it was *Alford*, I advised him ever to exercise his own careful judgment before resting on any dictum of “modern criticism” as truth: and, with reference to the particular point then in question, to consider whether, after St. Paul had quite recently before told the Thessalonian Christians

¹ See pp. 40, 41, 30.

² I have already, at p. 30, observed on the indistinctness of your views as to the meaning of the day of Christ.

that the first result of Christ's coming would be the gathering to Him into the air first of the risen departed ones of the Christian body, then of the Christians living at the time, it was credible that those Christians at Thessalonica should have thought Christ's coming to have actually taken place, at a time when neither any of their own Christian body, nor even the Apostle Paul, had themselves experienced the promised blessed rapture to meet their Lord in the air. This, after a little more had past between us as to the *ἐνεσηκεν*,¹ was sufficient to satisfy my friend; and a lesson of caution suggested which, I doubt not, will have been usefully thenceforward remembered by him. Other similar cases have come before me of young clergymen asserting very questionable, if not decidedly erroneous opinions, on the strength of statements to that effect in your Commentary.—To which might be added the indistinctness and obscurity at times of its explanations, chiefly when from Germanic sources. Not long since a clerical friend, having to take for his sermon the subject of John xvi. 8, "When he, the Paraclete, is come, he will reprove (*ἐλεγξει*, *convince*) the world concerning (*περι*) sin, and concerning righteousness, and concerning judgment," &c., spoke to me of the mistiness of the view of part at least of it left on his mind by your note on the passage.² Yet this,

¹ See the Note on this word at p. 92 of the 3rd volume of the 5th Edition of the *Horæ Apoc.*, just published. On the *μη σαλευθῆναι* of 2 Thess. ii. 2 we may fitly compare the *μη θροισθε* of Mark xiii. 7; each said in reference (as I understood the *ἐνεσηκεν*) to the *expected imminence* of Christ's second advent.

² Not very difficult surely, as I said to the friend who consulted me, is the true explanation. It is but a statement of the usual work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of a man, previously dead in trespasses and sins: for *κοσμος*, as Lücke justly observes, includes here, just as in John iii. 17, 19, and elsewhere, those who, though not at present converted, may yet hereafter be so. There is, 1st, his conviction in respect of his previous unbelief in the Lord Jesus Christ, after his accomplishment of the work of redemption, as the sin of sins: (compare John iii. 18, xv. 24, Acts ii. 36, 37:)

which is partly from Lücke, partly from Archdeacon Hare, and in part also your own, is by no means so misty as others that I could point out; and which indeed are a mystification, rather than elucidation, of Scripture. How different from the clearness, and sound sense and judgment, of our best English expositors! I must confess that when I hear crude novelties of thought on Scripture announced pretentiously by young theologians from the pulpit, (which, let me say, was the furthest from the spirit of the young friend in the ministry to whom I was just a little while since alluding,) as resulting from the “exegesis” of “modern criticism,” the tendency with myself, as well as with many others, I know, of the more experienced, sensible, and learned of our clergy, is not exactly to listen with any very deferential feeling to the announcement.

“When they talked of their Raphaels, Correggios, and stuff,
He shifted his trumpet, and only took snuff.”

Nor does this express the full amount of the resulting evil. Is it not the case that this deference to German criticism, even where simply misty and speculative, has had

2dly, his conviction respecting Christ's own perfect righteousness, as unto all and upon all them that believe, by virtue of his pleading it for them after that very going to the Father which the disciples ignorantly deprecated;—a conviction involving that of the total defectiveness before God of his own best righteousness: (compare Rom. iii. 22, Phil. iii. 6—9 :) 3dly, his conviction as to that judgment having begun on Satan, which is expressed elsewhere (Matt. xii. 29) under the figure of the strong man being bound, and cast out of the soul, who before occupied and ruled over it in peace: (compare John xii. 31, 32 :) a judgment, and ejection, experimentally known to each emancipated Christian; and effected through his reception, and personal application, of the two former teachings of the Holy Spirit.—A view this of the passage in question not very different, if I rightly understand you, from Lücke's, Hare's, and your own on the two first heads: but on the third more accordant with the text which defines the *judgment* meant as that *past on the Prince of the world*, not as the judgment formed in men's minds; and without your misty admixture of the *subjective* and the *objective* in the exposition.

a deleterious effect in weakening the mind of our young Academics, perverting it from its natural Anglo-Saxon good sense, and, in combination with other causes,¹ preparing it for the reception of the *irrationalism* (in the true sense of the word) of infidelity? And this even in the case of the clergy of our own Church! ² Little could I have believed a few years ago that to men of this class and profession, in our own most favoured country, there would be applicable the indignant saying of Burke relatively to the infidels of the French revolutionary era:—"They cannot strike the sun out of heaven; but they can raise a smouldering smoke, and hide it from their view!"

I am quite aware that you distinctly disclaim and oppose yourself to *such* "modern criticism," whether of the German or Anglo-Germanic school;³ and that you hold fast to the plain old blessed truth of our Divine Saviour's vicarious atoning sacrifice for us. And so too, *I would hope*, (though here you are not altogether consistent,) ⁴

¹ *E.g.*, the misty thoughts and writings of certain modern pseudo-liberal theological authors; shedding obscurity on the most precious gospel-truths; and enveloping them (to use Coleridge's happy expression) in the fog-blight of their own minds: also, again, the recklessly false caricatures of evangelic doctrines and character by other popular writers in semi-religious novels and romances. Let such writers read the real picture of the operation of evangelic principle in biographies such as that of Chalmers or Hewitson; men far above themselves in intellect, as well as in the higher exaltation of spirituality and holiness: and then think how such caricatures will appear even to themselves in the hour of death, and the light of eternity.

² I have spoken somewhat fully on this subject in a Paper at the end of the Appendix to the 3rd Volume of the 5th Edition of my *Horæ Apoc.*

³ "How capricious," you say on Mark v. 40, "*according to modern criticism*, must this Evangelist have been . . . in leaving out here," &c. And then you add; "Can testimony be stronger as to the untenableness of such a view?" This is against certain of the German Rationalistic critics who take the view, so impugned, of the mutual non-independence of the Evangelists.

⁴ See, for example, your view of Apoc. viii. 2, 3, pp. 70—72, *suprà*. So, too, your frequent and really reckless intimations, from time to time, of

in regard of that of his acting as Intercessor and High Priest, to plead that atoning sacrifice, and also His perfect righteousness, as man's representative, on the behalf of all that heartily believe on Him, before the throne of God. Still the measure of your deference to, and adoption of, the statements and mode of thought of German critics has, in my opinion, tended too plainly to injure the scriptural character of your Commentary ; and, in so far, to make it by no means a safe guide on doctrine for the theological students and younger clergy, for whom it is specially and professedly intended. Hence the solemn duty that I have felt it not to close my Pamphlet on that Apocalyptic subject of controversy which you have forced upon me without the accompanying critical notice and voice of warning respecting your General Commentary. And I pray you to accept this as my apology for such notice of it : and, at the same time, to believe that I am not the less your sincere friend and well-wisher : with the hearty desire that, eschewing whatever may have hitherto dimmed your testimony, you may, in these latter and perilous days of the Church,¹ become eminent, distinctly and unmistakably,

the irreconcilability of the statements on the same subject of the one Evangelist with the other.

¹ On the probability of our present near advance to the closing times of the present dispensation we are agreed. See what I have cited at p. 45, *suprà*, from your expressed opinion on this point.—And, let me ask, is not the Roman Papacy's late and present exposure of itself before the world, in its true character, confirmatory of this : answering so well as it does to the Apocalyptic Babylon's exposure, as prefigured in Apoc. xvii. ; a prefiguration next preceding that of Babylon's destruction ; and which is itself the precursor of Christ's second advent ?

Let me add, since you have spoken (albeit inconsistently*) against the *year-day* principle as applied to the 1260 days of prophecy, and the more definite view of the appointed time of the ending of the present dispensation therein implied,—more especially because of the incorrectness, as events

* See the Note, p. 94, *suprà*.

as a true exponent, and consistent advocate, of the pure Gospel faith.

E. B. ELLIOTT.

have proved, of the terminating dates of the end propounded by certain former expositors,—just two thoughts for your calm and careful consideration.

The first is that of the parallelism of the prophetic period of Daniel's 70 hebdomads which marked the time that was to elapse before Christ's first coming in humiliation, with that of the Apocalyptic periods marking the time before Christ's second coming :—its parallelism not otherwise only, but specially, in regard of the dubiousness of the true terminus à quo whence to calculate it. Hence probably many mistaken anticipations by Jews as to the time of Messiah's first advent, if arguing from Dan. ix. ; without however any impeachment thereby of the truth of the year-day principle so applied, or truth of the prophecy itself. Certainly, had I lived in the times shortly before the Christian æra, my own inclination would have been to calculate from *Cyrus'* decree for the Jews' return ; and then my expectation would have been falsified by the event. And so again, if calculating from *Darius'* decree as the terminus à quo. Yet, as measured from *Artaxerxes'* decree, the prophecy had its fulfilment. Would a Jew then have been justified, after, and because of, the failure of those primary calculations, in decrying the principle of any such definite principle of calculation ; so as you do in your Proleg. to the Apocalyptic Commentary, p. 251 ?

The other thought that I would beg you to consider is, what I have said in the new or 5th Edition of my *Horæ Apoc.* respecting the dubious terminus à quo of the *additional 75 days* of Dan. xii. : whether to be measured from the date of what I regard as the *primary* ending of the great prophetic period of the 1260 days, *i.e.* about 1790 ; or from that of the secondary and chief ending, about A.D. 1866. If from the *latter*, the *time of the end* will still have above 75 years to run, on the *year-day* principle of calculation, and my application of it.

JUST READY, THE FIFTH EDITION OF

HORÆ APOCALYPTICÆ;

A COMMENTARY ON THE APOCALYPSE,
CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ;

Including, also, an Examination of the Chief Prophecies of Daniel.

Illustrated by an Apocalyptic Chart, and Engravings from Medals and
other extant Monuments of Antiquity.

By the Rev. E. B. ELLIOTT, M.A.,
Incumbent of St. Mark's, Brighton, Prebendary of Heytesbury, and
sometime Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Carefully Revised, Corrected, Improved, and Enlarged, with some
additional Illustrative Plates, and a New Preface.

In 4 Vols. 8vo., cloth, price 2*l.* 16*s.*

Date Due

~~SEP 30 1951~~



PRINTED IN U. S. A.



BS2825 .E458
Apocalypsis Alfordiana : or Five

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00069 2907